GREGORY SCHOPEN

RITUAL RIGHTS AND BONES OF CONTENTION: MORE ON MONASTIC FUNERALS AND RELICS IN THE *MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA-VINAYA*

It is beginning to appear that the treatment of dead monks in Buddhist monastic communities may turn out to be a lively issue. There has, at least, in the last few years been a trickle of papers and parts of books addressing the issue and — in Buddhist Studies — such trickles are usually as close as we get to a flood. Much of this work has dealt with China and Japan. That work is detailed, historically textured, and theoretically interesting.[1] The work on India, however, has been — as it usually is by comparison — thin and uneven. Especially in regard to the treatment of textual sources dealing with monastic funerals, the presentation of the Indian material is inadequate. The one paper I know of lacks anything like historical boundaries; is limited largely to one monastic Order, and even then to only a part of that Order's monastic code; and is flawed by a tendency toward premature generalization.[2]

I cannot, of course, presume to solve all these problems, but here only hope to widen the evidential base for the discussion of monastic funerals in the one Indian Order that has received some attention, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Order. In so doing statements already made can be corrected, qualified or assigned to the bin.

Certainly one of the things about the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that makes, and will continue to make, any generalization in regard to it precarious, if not entirely foolhardy, is its size. It has been referred to in the scholarly literature as "cet énorme Vinaya," as "monumental" and "huge," as an "énorme compilation" or "une vaste compilation," as an "immense pot-pourri de la Discipline bouddhique," and — perhaps most accurately — as "ce Vinaya monstrueux . . . en soi un canon déjà complet."[3] In its complete form presented in Tibetan translation it consists, depending on the 'edition,' of from twelve to sixteen bulky volumes. Probably few, if any, modern scholars apart from Csoma, who was stuck in an unheated monastic cell for a long Himalayan

Journal of Indian Philosophy **22**: 31—80, 1994.

winter, have been able to read all of it even quickly, let alone carefully study it. I have not, and each time I dip into it I find more and more of interest.[4]

What has been reported so far, though presented under the sub-title 'Monastic Funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,' reflects — and that imperfectly — only, in fact, what is found in two sections of this "monstrous vinaya," the *Vinaya-vastu* and the *Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, which correspond roughly to what in the Pāli *Vinaya* is called the *Khandaka*. These two sections contain at least two separate, though similar, sets of formal rules governing the performance of monastic funerals, and a significant number of narrative references to such funerals or to elements thereof. This might suggest that the topic was of some concern to the monk or monks who compiled these two sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, but it tells us nothing about the extent of that concern, or whether it is addressed as well in other sections of this *Vinaya*, notably in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, the counter-part to the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. It also does not tell us about the presence or absence of this concern in what may have been, from a historical point-of-view, an even more important part of an Order's *vinaya* literature.

Charles Hallisey has suggested recently

> . . . that Theravādins found the [canonical] *Vinaya* both too little and too much. They found it too little in so far as the canonical text required elucidation and clarification, and as a result, massive commentaries and glossaries were written on it . . . They found it too much in so far as the size of the canonical *Vinaya* made it unwieldy and they consequently wrote diverse summaries and compendiums . . . Such works were written to present the *Vinaya's* practical message in a more manageable fashion . . . This associated literature makes relating the canonical *Vinaya* to actual practice in diverse contexts more complex than has generally been admitted by students of Buddhism.[5]

The suggestion here may suggest in turn at least the possibility that the Pāli *Vinaya* reached the typical monk — if it reached him at all — not in its canonical form, but in the form of "summaries," "compendiums," or "handbooks," and that it was sources of this sort that had some impact on actual monastic behavior.

Obviously, if the Theravādins had problems with an "unwieldy" *vinaya*, the Mūlasarvāstivādins might well have been overwhelmed, and they would have had even more pressing need for "the *Vinaya's*

practical message in more manageable form." Although we know much less about them, the Mūlasarvāstivādins too did indeed produce "summaries" and "compendiums" of their *vinaya*, the most authoritative of which seems to have been Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra*, with its auto-commentary, the *Svavyākhyānābhidhāna-vinaya-sūtra-vṛtti*. If, in fact, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* too reached the majority of its monks in the form of "summaries," then clearly it will be important to determine what such a summary has to say about monastic funerals if we are to get a sense of the significance such ritual forms might have had over time.[6]

What is presented here, then, is intended to address these specific lacunae, to correct, as I said above, some of what has gone before, and to provide a more comprehensive *sketch*, though by no means a complete study, of the place of monastic funerals in *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* sources. Nothing more.

We can start with the observation that rules regarding monastic funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* are not, indeed, found only in its *Vinaya-vastu* or *Kṣudraka-vastu*. There is as well at least one set of such rules in its *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*. They occur as a part of the long account devoted to the 80th *Pāyantika* rule which makes it an offense for a monk to enter a village at an irregular or "wrong" time except when there is a reason (*anyatra tadrūpāt pratyayāt*), and they are promulgated in connection with the death of the Monk Kālodāyin. Kālodāyin was designated by the Buddha "The Best of Those (Monks) who Make Families Pious" (*kulaprasādakānāṃ . . . agro*)[7] and several stories are given — at least one quite funny[8] — illustrating his power to convert. But a married woman who has been sleeping with the leader of a group of thieves is afraid that the Monk Kālodāyin has found her out and conspires with her lover to kill the monk. The monk is enticed into a house — and we pick up the account from that point, translating from the Tibetan text of the Derge edition found in the Taipei reprint:[9]

The Funeral of the Monk Kālodāyin
— *Vinayavibhaṅga* —
(Derge Nya 65a.2—66a.4)

The ring leader of thieves, having pulled his sword from its sheath, waited at the door.

Then the Venerable Udāyin came out, and the ring leader, with a mind devoid of compassion and without concern for the other world, having nearly severed his head, slaughtered him on the ground.

An old woman saw him killing the Noble One and standing there, "Who is this," she said, "that has done such a rash thing?"

The ring leader said: "You must tell no one, or I will make sure that you too end up in the same condition!"

She was terrified and was then unable to speak. Thinking that perhaps someone following the tracks of the Eminent One would come by later,[10] she — given the circumstances — remained silent.

The two of them, with minds devoid of compassion and without concern for the other world, hiding the body of the Venerable Udāyin in a heap of rubbish, left it there.

That day the monk in charge of the fortnightly gathering, sitting at the senior's end of the assembly, said: "Has someone determined the inclination of the Reverend Udāyin? The Reverend Udāyin is not here."

Then the Blessed One said to the monks: "Monks, that one who is the Best of Those who Make Families Pious has been killed. His monastic robes must be brought back, and the honors for his body should be performed!"

The Blessed One set forth until having been stopped by the gate of Śrāvastī, the Blessed One then caused a brightness like that of gold to shoot forth. He filled all of Śrāvastī with a luminosity like that of pure gold.

Prasenajit, the King who had arisen in Kosala, thought to himself: "Why (65b) has all of Śrāvastī been filled with a luminosity like that of pure gold?" He thought further: "Without a doubt, the Blessed One wishes to come!"

Together with his retinue of wives, and taking the key to the city, he unlocked the gate and the Blessed One entered Śrāvastī.

Prasenajit, the King who had arisen in Kosala, thought: "But why has the Blessed One come into Śrāvastī at an irregular time?" But since Buddhas, Blessed Ones, are not easy to approach, and are difficult to resist, he was incapable of putting a question to the Buddha, the Blessed One.

The Blessed One, together with the community of disciples, having gone ahead, Prasenajit, the King who had arisen in Kosala, together with his retinue of wives, went following everywhere behind the Blessed One, until they came to the place where that heap of rubbish was.

The Blessed One then addressed the monks: "Monks, he who was the Best of Those who Make Families Pious is hidden here. Remove him!"

He was removed, and those who had depended on the Venerable Udāyin, seeing there what had truly happened in regard to the Noble One, said: "Since he was our Good Spiritual Friend, does the Blessed One allow us to perform the honors for his body?"

The Blessed One did not allow it.

Prasenajit, the King who had arisen in Kosala said: "Since he was a friend of mine from our youth, does the Blessed One allow me to perform the honors for his body?"

The Blessed One did not allow it.

The Queen Mālikā said: "Since he was my teacher, does the Blessed One allow me to perform the honors for his body?

The Blessed One allowed it.

The Queen Mālikā, then, having had the dirt removed from the body of the Venerable Udāyin with chalk, had it bathed with perfumed water. Having adorned a bier with various colored cotton clothes, she put the body onto it and arranged it.

Then the Blessed One, together with the community of disciples, having gone ahead, the King, together with his retinue of wives, went following behind them.

Having put the bier down at an open, extensive spot, Queen Mālikā, heaping up a pile all of aromatic woods, cremated the body. She extinguished the pyre with milk, and having put the bones into a golden pot, she had a mortuary *stūpa* erected at a crossing of four great roads. Raising an umbrella, a banner and a flag, doing honor with perfumes, strings of garlands, incense, aromatic powders and musical instruments, she venerated both its feet.[11] After that, the Blessed One, having assigned the reward, departed.

In addition to a number of details concerning the language of the text, there are as well several interrelated points of interest in this account, most of which cluster around the exhortation attributed to the Buddha which signals the beginning of monastic participation in the affair. The Buddha is made to say: "Monks, that one who is the Best of Those who Make Families Pious has been killed. His monastic robes must be brought back, and the honors for his body should be performed:" *dge slong dag khyim dad par byed pa rnams kyi mchog de bsad kyis / chos gos dag long shig dang de'i lus la mchod pa bya'o.* There are as it were two injunctions here, two matters of monastic concern: attending to the deceased monk's property, and attending to the deceased monk's body. Both concerns are addressed elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.* In the set of rules governing monastic funerals in the *Cīvara-vastu* of the *Vinaya-vastu* the distribution of the deceased monk's property is, in fact, the central issue, and proper attendance to the body is made a precondition to its successful and proper completion.[12] Elsewhere in the *Cīvara-vastu* several long paragraphs are given over to ruling on what should occur when a monk dies at a monastery other than his 'own,' and the central issue is, again, with the property of the dead monk. Typical of the form and content of these paragraphs is the following case: *upagatakānām āvāse anupagatako bhikṣur āgatya kālaṃ kuryāt. upagatakair anupagatakānāṃ dūto 'nupreṣayitavyaḥ. sabrahmacārī vaḥ kālagataḥ. haratāsya pātracīvaram iti,* "A monk who has not entered into the retreat there, having come, might die in a parish of those who have entered the retreat there. Those who have entered the retreat there must send a

messenger to those who have not, saying 'a fellow-monk of yours has died. You must come and get his bowl and robe!'"[13] The wording here, though clumsy in translation, makes it clear that the status of "fellow-monks" (*sabrahmacārin*) is determined by where a monk has entered into retreat, and that fellow-monks have a right to, and responsibility to go and get, the estate of a deceased fellow-monk regardless of where he might die. These rulings also occasionally are given narrative expression. Perhaps the most famous account — and one we will return to — concerns the death of Śāriputra. After Śāriputra's death — according to the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* —

> His attending novice (*dge sbyong gi ched*) Cunda performed the honors for the body on the remains of the Venerable Śāriputra (*tshe dang ldan pa śā ri'i bu'i ring bsrel la lus kyis mchod pa byas te*), and taking the remains (*ring bsrel*), his bowl and monastic robes, set off for Rājagṛha. Going in due order he arrived at Rājagṛha . . . Being seated to one side the attending novice Cunda said this to the Venerable Ānanda: 'Reverend Ānanda you should know that my preceptor (*mkhan po*), the Reverend Śāriputra, has entered into final nirvāṇa — these are his remains and his bowl and monastic robes.'[14]

All of these considerations seem to be telescoped into the first part of the injunction attributed to the Buddha in our account of the death of Kālodāyin: "His monastic robes must be brought back!" But the second part of this injunction is also of interest.

The Buddha is made to say in regard to the monk Kālodāyin: *dge slong dag . . . de'i lus la mchod pa bya'o*, "Monks . . . the honors for his body should be performed." This same injunction occurs elsewhere and there is virtually no doubt about what it translates. Significantly, as we will see, the first statement Guṇaprabha makes in his *Vinaya-sūtra* in regard to monastic funerals is *tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa shi ba'i lus la mchod pa bya'o*, "Honor is to be done to the body of a deceased fellow-monk." But such an injunction had already occurred in the *Cīvara-vastu* and for that we have the Sanskrit: *bhagavān āha: bhikṣubhis tasya pūrvaṃ śarīrapūjā kartavyeti*, "The Blessed One said: 'By the monks the honor for the body of him (i.e. the deceased monk) is first to be performed" (*dge slong rnams kyis sngar de'i ro la [= lus] mchod pa byas la . . .*).[15] What the Buddha is made to say in the account of the death of Kālodāyin is, then, that the monks have an obligation to perform what in these texts is commonly, though not

exclusively, called *śarīra-pūjā.* In the context of the 80th *Pāyantika* rule in which this account occurs the monastic obligation to perform *śarīra-pūjā* is apparently important enough to abrogate the otherwise strict rule against entering a village at an "irregular" or "wrong time" (*dus ma yin par*).

It has recently been suggested that the term *śarīra-pūjā* in Sanskrit and its equivalent in Pāli have given rise to some major textual and historical misinterpetations. Though it has been habitually taken to refer to the "worship of relics," a close examination of the texts themselves does not seem to support such an interpretation, and the evidence appears to be overwhelming that the term originally — and for a long time — referred to the ritual handling or preparation of the body prior to cremation, though sometimes it seems also to include the latter.[16] While it is true that the term *śarīra-pūjā* is not always used in accounts of monastic funerals, the terms that are used in its place only strengthen the suggestion that it refers to the ritual preparation of a dead body. We find, for example, phrases like *bhikṣavas tam ādāya dahanaṃ gatāḥ . . . bhikṣavas tam ādahane saṃskārya vihāram āgatāḥ,* "The monks, having taken that (i.e. the dead monk's body) up, had gone to the cremation . . . after having performed the funeral ceremonies for him at the cremation ground, the monks returned to the *vihāra,*" or *bhikṣavas tam ādahanaṃ nītvā saṃskārya vihāraṃ āgatāḥ* which is almost identical.[17] Likewise in the rules governing monastic funerals in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* the Buddha is made to say *dge slong dag de lta bas na gnang gis dge slong shi ba'i rim gro bya'o,* "Now then, monks, with my authorization, funeral ceremonies for a deceased monk are to be performed."[18] Where elsewhere the term *śarīra-pūjā* is used, here in exactly the same sort of contexts we find *saṃskārya* and *rim gro bya.* All these terms are clearly interchangeable, but *saṃskārya* and *rim gro bya* can in such cases only denote "funeral ceremonies" directed toward the body. The fact that they are used interchangeably with *śarīra-pūjā* would seem to confirm that this is what that term too denoted.[19]

Although, then, it is virtually certain that all these texts are mandating or referring to funeral ceremonies, to the ritual handling of a dead monk's body, it is still not certain what was included in such ceremonies or what *śarīra-pūjā* entailed. It is here that our *Vinaya*-

vibhaṅga passage is able to add one detail. It contains one of the very few references I have met so far to what one would expect to have been a common element of such procedures. Having gained permission to perform the *śarīra-pūjā* for the monk Kālodāyin, Queen Mālikā first has "the dirt removed from the body of the Venerable Udāyin with chalk" (*tshe dang ldan pa 'char ka'i lus de sa dkar gyis dril phyi byed du bcug nas*). This is the only reference I know to the use of "chalk" in such a context. In fact I am not sure what *sa dkar* refers to here. The only Sanskrit equivalent in Chandra's *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* for *sa dkar* is *makkola*, which seems to mean "chalk," but also "white-wash," "plaster." The standard Tibetan dictionaries, moreover, give *sa dkar* as the same as *dkar rtsi*, "whitewash, consisting of lime or some other earthy colour." In any case there is a good chance that this operation may have been exceptional, being necessitated by the fact that the body had first been dumped in a heap of garbage.[20] The second operation that Queen Mālikā had performed, however, was probably much more standard.

Our text says that after "Having had the dirt removed from the body," Queen Mālikā "had it bathed with perfumed water," (*spos chus 'khur bcug ste*). Since the body had already been cleaned, this obviously was not the function of this procedure, and in fact some form of purely ritual washing of the corpse is an extremely common element in funeral practices almost everywhere. But, although such ritual washing may have formed a common element of *śarīra-pūjā*, I have so far only met with one other reference even to something like it. In a curious story in the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* concerning a monk appropriately named Mahākāla people began to suspect — because Mahākāla "was one who obtained everything from a cemetery" (*thams cad dur khrod pa dang ldan pa yin te*) — that he was eating corpses. Some brahmin boys decide to try to find out. They say "One of us should pretend to be a dead person, the rest of us will perform the honors in the cemetery" (*bdag cag las gcig shi ba'i cha lugs su byas pa de bdag cag gis dur khrod du bkur bar bya'o*). As a part of this 'performance' the text says the 'dead body' was "anointed with bdellium and oil" (*yang ba dang / 'bru mar gyis bskus te*).[21]

Again, although explicit reference to a bier adorned with colored clothes is a common element of secular funerals described in these

vinaya texts,[22] there are few such references in the accounts of monastic funerals. Apart from our account of the funeral of Kālodāyin, such biers are, however, also mentioned in the account of the funeral of Mahāprajāpatī found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu.*[23]

But in addition to washing or anointing of the corpse and the use of biers, our text also presents us with two other elements not noted before: explicit reference to the erection of a *stūpa* as, seemingly, a part of the funeral ritual itself; and the performance of the *śarīra-pūjā* for a monk by a lay person. In regard to the first it has been maintained — somewhat disconcertingly — both that "It appears . . . that at least Mūlasarvāstivāda texts do not seem to link funeral activity *per se* with the erection of *stūpas* for the local monastic dead," and that "the construction of a *stūpa* — if it is included at all — signalled the end of *śarīra-pūjā*, not its beginnings."[24] Obviously we cannot have it both ways, and our text — the first Mūlasarvāstivādin text so far reported explicitly to "link" funeral activity with the making of a *stūpa* — makes the first assertion no longer viable, but also points to another problem as well: the term *stūpa* — like the term *vihāra* — is used as if it had a single known referent, as if, in other words, we all know what we and our texts are talking about. But the *stūpa* referred to in the account of Kālodāyin's funeral cannot possibly be the sort of thing we find in books on Buddhist Architecture if for no other reason than it was, as it were, built in a day. For the narrator of our text the washing of the body, the procession, the cremation, the collecting of the bones, and the erection of the *stūpa* were clearly conceived of only as different moments in a single process: they all took place on the same day. If nothing else the conclusion of our account would indicate this. The rules governing monastic funerals in the *Cīvara-vastu*, the *Kṣudraka-vastu* and, as we will see, in Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra*, all agree that the final moment in the actual funeral, the final act before the participants in the funeral disperse, is the assigning of the reward or merit of a recitation of Dharma to the deceased (*tam uddiśya dharmaśravaṇaṃ dattvā dakṣiṇāṃ uddiśya; yon bsngo zhing rgyun chags gsum gyi chos mnyan pa byin nas 'dong bar bya'o; chos mnyan pa dang yon bshad pa dag bya'o*). But this final act of a monastic funeral does not take place in our text until after Mālikā has had the *stūpa* erected, and the Buddha himself is narratively, continuously present throughout all of the pro-

cedures. It is only after Mālikā has had the *stūpa* raised, has honored it and "venerated its feet," that the Buddha, "having assigned the reward," is said to have departed (. . . *gdugs dang / rgyal mtshan dang / ba dan bsgreng zhing / dri dang / phreng brgyu dang / bdug spos dang / phye ma dang / sil snyan dag gis mchod pa byas / rkang pa gnyis la phyag 'tshal nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis yon bshad pa mdzad de gshegs so /*).

Considerations of this kind would seem effectively to rule out the possibility that the *stūpa* envisioned was a major architectural form, and an old observation of A. H. Longhurst is undoubtedly here — and in many other cases — pertinent:

> The famous *stūpas* of Bharhut, Sāñchī and Amarāvati have been so often described and illustrated by different writers on Indian art, that one is apt to regard these once magnificent Buddhist shrines as typical examples of *stūpas*; but as a matter of fact, *stūpas* of this class were the exception . . . The *stūpas* erected over the remains of ordinary members of the Buddhist community were very humble little structures. The ashes of the dead were placed in an earthenware pot and covered with a lid, and the humble little *stūpas* erected over it. Plenty of Buddhist *stūpas* of this class may still be seen in the Madras Presidency and also in Ceylon.[25]

It is very likely, then, that it was a 'very humble little structure' of this kind that our account of the funeral of Kālodāyin is referring to, and that, indeed, the construction of a *stūpa* "of this class" may well "have signalled the end of *śarīra-pūjā*, not its beginnings."[26] The "humble" nature of these little structures may explain why we have so little certain knowledge of them in the archeological record, but the recognition of this class of humble funeral *stūpa* does not in itself completely solve the problem of the relationship of Buddhist funeral activity to what might more legitimately be called a cult of relics. Some further clarification, however, might be had by looking at the second of the additional elements noted above which have so far only been found in the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga's* account of Kālodāyin's funeral.

We have already had occasion to cite the injunctions attributed to the Buddha in regard to the imperative to perform *śarīra-pūjā* for a deceased fellow-monk. They all either — like that in the *Cīvara-vastu* — explicitly declare that it is to be performed by monks (*bhikṣubhis tasya pūrvaṃ śarīra-pūjā kartavyeti*), or — like that in the *Vinaya-sūtra* — occur in contexts where this is clearly implicit. In narrative references to the funerals of monks it is, as well, virtually always monks

who perform those funerals, and even in accounts where there is some reference to a lay presence — as in the account of the funeral of Mahāprajāpatī — it is the monks who feel the obligation, and the monks who have the active role. When the Nun Mahāprajāpatī dies and monks in various distant places become aware of it, the text says those monks thought ' "If the person of the Buddha passed away into final *nirvāṇa* we would go to take care of the performance of the superior honors for his body" ' (*sangs rgyas kyi sku yongs su mya ngan las 'das na / de'i lus la mchod pa lhag par bya ba la brtson par byas 'dong ngo snyam nas*), and then set off for her residence to do so. Monks too are explicitly said to have even carried her bier, and those of the nuns who died with her, and to have performed "the great honor:" "The Venerables Nanda, Aniruddha, Ānanda and Rahula then lifted up the bier of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī. The Blessed One also held on to it with his right hand. The remaining monks too lifted up the biers of the remaining nuns. Then performing the great honor, having carried them away, they laid the biers down at an appropriate, isolated spot" (*de nas tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo dan / ma 'gags pa dang / kun dga' bo dang / sgra gcan zin gyis skye dgu'i bdag mo chen mo go'u ta mi'i khyogs bteg go / bcom ldan 'das kyis kyang phyag g-yas pas bzung ngo / dge slong lhag ma rnams kyis kyang / dge slong ma lhag ma rnams kyi khyogs bteg go / de nas mchod pa chen po byas te khyer nas / sa phyogs bar skabs dben par khyogs rnams bzhag go /*).[27] The lay persons present — and there is a large group of them including King Prasenajit, Anāthapiṇḍada, et al. — are said to have only provided the requisite materials like biers, perfume, incense, etc., and to have cremated the bodies: nothing more.

On the basis of these kinds of considerations, and the passages in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* then known, it has been said — with typical overstatement — "that the laity was allowed no place in these [funeral] procedures, that the funeral of a local monk was an exclusively monastic affair, participation being limited to monks and monks alone."[28] That these remarks will need some qualification is obvious in light of the account of the funeral of Kālodāyin in the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga.* However, it is worth noting that this account itself seems to start at least from something like the same position, seems to assume that it is, at least, the general rule.

We have seen already that the injunction to perform *śarīra-pūjā* for Kālodāyin is addressed to monks (*dge slong dag . . . de'i lus la mchod pa bya'o*) even in the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, and that it is this monastic obligation which allows the monks to enter a village at what would otherwise be an "irregular" or "wrong" time. It seems, then, to be both assumed and accepted by the redactor of the account that monks, and monks alone, are responsible for the performance of *śarīra-pūjā* for a fellow monk. But as the account develops a series of competing claims are put forth for what now appears as the 'privilege' of such a performance. First "those who had depended on the Venerable Udāyin" (*gang dag tshe dang ldan pa 'char ka la brten nas*) — and these by context appear to be monks — seek permission to perform the *śarīra-pūjā* on the grounds that Kālodāyin was their "good spiritual friend" or *kalyāṇa-mitra* (*'di bdag cag gi dge ba'i bshes gnyen lags na / bcom ldan 'das kyis bdag cag 'di'i lus la mchod pa bgyid par ci gnang*). But they are denied. Then King Prasenajit seeks permission on the grounds that Kālodāyin was a friend of his from their youth (*'di bdag gi chung po grogs lags na*), but he too is denied. The successful claim is that of Queen Mālikā: "Since he was my teacher, does the Blessed One allow me to perform the honors for his body? (*'di bdag gi slob dpon lags na / bcom ldan 'das kyis bdag 'di'i lus la mchod pa bgyid par ci gnang*).

These competing claims appear to be based on the degree of relationship between the person or persons making them and the deceased monk, and the successful claim seems to be that which is based on the closest formally acknowledged ecclesiastical bond. If we start from what appears to be taken as given — that the general rule was indeed that monks had the responsibility and privilege of performing *śarīra-pūjā* — then the King's claim appears to be the weakest: although it might have had some weight in secular contexts, long-standing friendship would have had little or no ecclesiastical force. The claim of 'those who had depended on Kālodāyin' — a claim made apparently by at least one group of monks within the larger community — would have been stronger, but their grounds lack ecclesiastical or formal specificity. The term *dge ba'i bshes gnyen* or *kalyāṇa-mitra* does not denote a formal ecclesiastical relationship, but rather an informal spiritual bond.[29] Mālikā, finally, appears not to

have been simply a lay person, but a "lay-sister," an *upāsikā*, a woman who had a formally acknowledged connection with the monastic community.[30] She in any case claimed that the monk Kālodāyin was her *slob dpon* or *ācārya*, and this would make her his *antevāsin*. This is a formal relationship with a specific set of mutual obligations, and it is this relationship which our text allows, it seems, to determine who receives the privilege of performing the "honor for the body" in this case.[31]

It is important to note two further things here. First, while our text might establish a precedent that might allow for the occasion where a wealthy lay-sister might seek and gain permission to perform the funeral of a monk who was her *ācārya*, it does not establish or allow this as a general rule. In fact our text seems to carefully avoid making any rule here, and in so doing appears to reinforce what is elsewhere explicitly delivered as just such a general rule: that it is the responsibility and privilege of monks and only monks to perform the funeral rites for a fellow-monk.

The second point concerns the very idea of privilege. There has been very little analysis of what might be called relationships of power among different sections of Buddhist communities, and what little has been said in this regard has not been distinguished by its subtlety. Such a lack may be particularly unfortunate for an understanding of at least a part of the *vinaya*, in terms both of its style and its content. One of the things that any successful religious institution must do, it seems, is continuously negotiate and renegotiate questions of privilege and access to religiously important people, objects and activities. This, it seems, may well be an important function of at least a part of the *vinaya*. What emerges from our text, for example, is a clear indication that the performance of the funeral ritual for a monk was not thought of simply as an obligation, but was presented as a privilege sought after by competing constituencies or groups. Though by general rule assigned to fellow-monks, access to and participation in this ritual form apparently had to be negotiated in certain circumstances, and this — above all else — may be the purpose behind our text. Such negotiations can sometimes be complex.

In the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya-vibhaṅga* there is, for example, a general rule that says that "If a nun accepts an image of the

Buddha containing relics it is a *pātayantika* offense" (*dge slong mas sangs rgyas kyi sku gzugs brnyan ring bsrel dang bcas pa len na ltung byed do*). Such a rule, if consistently enacted, would, of course, have made it all but impossible for nuns to establish their own and independent shrines or places of worship, and this may well have been the original intent. But the formulation of the rule as we now have it is followed by a series of amendments, the first of which is: "If there are no relics" such acceptance is only a minor offense (*ring bsrel med pa yin na nyes byas so*), allowing at least some flexibility. And the rule is then finally and seriously softened: "If (such an image) is accepted with the idea of doing worship to the Teacher, and if it is placed in the hands of a female novice or of one who makes things allowable (*kalpikāra, kappiya-kāraka*) there is no offence" (*gal te ston pa la mchod pa'i du shes kyis len par byed cing / dge tshul ma 'am rung bar byed pa'i lag tu bzhang pa la ni ltung ba med do*).[32] It is not at all improbable that we have condensed here in this rule of but a line and a half a whole series of negotiations and an outline of the significant stages in a "struggle" by Mūlasarvāstivādin nuns to achieve ritual independence. It is, in fact, not improbable that a considerable number of *vinaya* rules as we now have them reflect the 'histories' of similar sorts of negotiations.

Questions of privilege and access, however, almost certainly did not arise only between monks and nuns. They almost certainly formed a continuous and delicate part of the relationships between monastic communities and 'lay' communities. I would see the account of the funeral of the monk Kālodāyin in the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* as an attempt to negotiate one such question, the question of who gets to perform and participate in monastic funerals. But there certainly were others, at least one of which may be of particular interest to us for a variety of good reasons.

The question at issue here presumably would have been an important one — it comes down to who had control of and greatest access to what might legitimately be considered the most sacred of Buddhist "objects": what we call relics. The account that to my knowledge treats this question most fully is the account of the deposition of the relics of the monk Śāriputra found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.* Strictly speaking — at least according to the internal

chronology adopted by the texts — it is this account, and not the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, which records the beginnings of the relic cult. It is, of course, important because of that, but it is particularly interesting for us because (1) it seems further to clarify the relationship between monastic funerals and what can be considered an ongoing relic cult; (2) it involves a particularly clear case of protracted negotiations of privilege and access between the monastic and lay communities; and (3) it forms a background to some of what we will see in Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra.*

The whole story is a long one.[33] It begins in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* immediately after the rules governing monastic funerals have been given, but the accompanying *uddāna*, or summary of contents, makes it clear that the redactors considered the two as separate sections, giving key words for each (*ro ni bsreg par bya ba dang / śā ri'i bu yi mchod rten dang*).[34] It starts with a curious story — the first part of which is also found in the *Saṅghabheda-vastu* — about Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana making a visit to the hells. There they encounter the non-Buddhist Teacher Purāṇa undergoing some fairly unpleasant torments and he asks the two monks to take a message back to his disciples. Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana are to say to Purāṇa's disciples that he says "Since whenever you honor my *stūpa* my suffering just then becomes intolerably great, hereafter it should not be done!" (. . . *khyed kyis ji lta ji ltar nga'i mchod rten la brjed pa byas pa de lta de ltar nga la sdug bsngal ches mi bzad par gyur gyis phyin chad ma byed par thong zhig ces* (Ta 355a.1), *yathā yathā ca śrāvakā stūpakārān kurvanti tathā tathā tīvravedanāṃ vedayāmi. tad arhasi madīyām avasthāṃ teṣāṃ nivedya nivārayitum. mā tasya stūpakāraṃ kariṣyatheti*[35]). This is a rare and clear expression of what was probably a widely held belief: the belief that what was done to a deceased individual's *stūpa* affected the 'individual' himself.

When Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana return and deliver the message the disciples of Purāṇa are not pleased and plot the demise of the two monks. They succeed in waylaying Maudgalyāyana and beat him — literally — to a pulp ("They smashed his limbs and appendages like sugar-cane," *de dag gis de'i yan lag dang nying lag 'dam bu bzhin bcom nas* . . . Ta 356a.3). Śāriputra returns and finds his "limbs and appendages having been smashed like sugar-cane scattered on the

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the "Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya"*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 22:1 (1994:Mar.) p.31

ground" and — since somehow Maudgalyāyana is still alive — the text says "The Venerable Śāriputra, having tucked the Venerable Maudgalyāyana into his upper robe like a little baby, carried him away to a *vihāra* (*de nas tshe dang ldan pa śā ri'i bus / tshe dang ldan pa mo'u 'gal gyi bu byis pa chung ngu bzhin du bla gos kyi nang du bcug nas gtsug lag khang du khyer ba dang*; Ta 356a.7). Maudgalyāyana manages to — if you will — pull himself together for one last begging round in Rājagṛha, but forms the intention to "pass away into final *nirvāṇa*." Śāriputra, becoming aware of this, says "Since the Venerable Maudgalyāyana will pass away into final *nirvāṇa*, why should I remain" (*tshe dang ldan pa mo'u 'gal gyi bu chen po yongs su mya ngan las 'da' na / bdag ci ste 'dug*; Ta 358b.2), and he too makes the decision to die, which he then does.

According to the text Śāriputra dies at the village of Nalada, some distance away from Rājagṛha where the narrator has situated the text itself. This may account for the fact that there is no account of a funeral. We are, however, told — as we have seen — that the funereal *śarīra-pūjā* for Śāriputra was performed by his attending novice Cunda (*tshe dang ldan pa śā ri'i bu'i ring bsrel la lus kyis mchod pa byas te*), and only after that were his remains (*ring bsrel*), bowl and robe taken back to Rājagṛha. Though small, this is an important detail since it establishes a boundary between the funereal *śarīra-pūjā* and everything in the account that follows it: here, too, then — as we have seen elsewhere everywhere except in the account of the funeral of Kālodayin — the funereal *śarīra-pūjā* was an exclusively monastic affair.

When Cunda hands the remains of Śāriputra over to Ānanda — and here we can begin to use our word 'relic' — Ānanda expresses his dismay and disconsolation at the news of Śāriputra's death: when he heard that Śāriputra was dead, Ānanda says "my body was afflicted, my bearings confused, the various teachings I had heard too were left aside" (*bdag gi lus gdung bar gyur cing / phyogs kyang bslad / chos tho[s] pa'i rnams kyang bskyung bar gyur ro*; Ta 359b.1). The Buddha then delivers to Ānanda a long homily on death, a good part of which has echoes in, or itself echoes, passages in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. But its very beginning is distinct and worthy of note. The Buddha's initial response to Ānanda's grief is to say:

"But, Ānanda, did the Monk Śāriputra, taking the accumulation of morality with him, enter into final *nirvāna*?" (*kun dga' bo ci dge slong śā ri'i bus tshul khrims kyi phung po khyer te yons su mya ngan las 'das sam* Ta 395b.2).

"No, Reverend."

The Buddha then asks in the same way about concentration, wisdom, release and the knowledge and vision of release and Ānanda again says no. This too is followed with the same question in regard to a standard list of the "limbs of enlightenment," with the same answer.

We have, then, to this point in the account two statements — both indirect — about what is left behind or remains after Śāriputra's death: the narrative says, in effect, that first of all what remains are "relics" (*ring bsrel*); but the homily says that the "accumulation, heap, substratum, or material form" (*phung po = rāśi, skandha, upadhi*) of morality, concentration, wisdom, release, and knowledge and vision of release is what remains. The relationship between the two — between relics and the accumulation or substratum of morality, concentration, wisdom, etc. — is here neither stated nor resolved and could, of course, have been interpreted in a number of ways. It is, however, hard to imagine that what we see in some early inscriptions from the North-west, in the learned Aśvaghoṣa, and in a late book of the *Milindapañha* is not somehow related to our account, or to one very like it, and does not represent at least one fairly widespread interpretation or resolution of the relationship between these two seemingly disparate categories of things. These various sources seem, in fact, to dissolve the distinction between the two, and to suggest that one — the "relic" — is permeated, saturated, infused and enlivened by the other. It seemingly cannot be an accident that we find in inscriptions, for example, that relics — one of the things our account says Śāriputra left behind — are said to be permeated or saturated by the other things that our account says remain. The inscriptions, in fact, use what is almost exactly the same vocabulary and refer — as has been noted elsewhere — to relics as "infused with morality, infused with concentration, wisdom, release and knowledge and vision" (*ima dhadu śila(pari)bhavita samasiprañavimutiñaṇadra(śá)paribhavita*), or simply as "infused with morality, infused with concentration, infused with wisdom" (*śilaparibhavida sama(s)iparibhaveṃtu prañaparibhavida*).[36]

The fourth book of the *Milindapañha* says almost exactly the same as the first of these, and Aśvaghoṣa says that relics are "full of virtue" (*dge legs gang ba*).[37] In the present state of our ignorance there is, of course, no way to connect directly any of these sources with our text, or to know if what they assert was even a part of the intention of the original author of that text. But it is, again, hard to rule out the distinct possibility that our account of the death of Śāriputra, its Pāli parallel in the *Saṃyutta*, or a very similar account, forms at least a part of the background to these other sources, hard to rule out that the conception of a relic as saturated with morality, concentration, wisdom, etc. resulted in part from the kind of purely narrative conjunction found in our account of Śāriputra.

Apart from considerations of this kind we need to note two things. None of the narrative dealing with relics — their return to Rājagṛha, their presentation to Ānanda, the homily they seem to give rise to — has anything to do with Śāriputra's funeral: they all take place after Cunda has performed what the Tibetan text somewhat unhappily calls *tshe dang ldan pa śā ri'i bu'i ring bsrel la lus kyis mchod pa*, "the honors for the body on the remains of the Venerable Śāriputra." There is no part in any of this assigned to lay persons. The redactor of our text takes it very much as a given that not only is the performance of a monk's funeral a monastic concern, but also — and this is the second point of note — he takes it as a given that any 'relics' that result are to be kept in the keeping of other monks: the novice Cunda initially collects and returns them to Rājagṛha; he presents them to the monk Ānanda and Ānanda continues to keep them in his possession. In fact the long homily delivered by the Buddha has no bearing on the disposition of Śāriputra's relics. After the homily a narrative break occurs with the text simply saying: "Then the Venerable Ānanda, having praised and rejoiced in that which was spoken by the Blessed One, and honoring with his head the feet of the Blessed One, departed from his presence." But this, of course, is not the end of the story because if monks retain unmodified the privilege of possession of such relics the laity will have no access — we might expect, then, the kinds of negotiations we have seen in the account of Kālodāyin's funeral.

Without indicating how much time elapses the account, in fact,

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the "Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya"*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 22:1 (1994:Mar.) p.31

immediately continues with what I translate here in full interspersed with some remarks:[38]

Negotiating the Control of Relics

Then the Blessed One, having stayed as long as he pleased at Rājagṛha, set off and went towards Śrāvastī. Having set off and gone he in due course arrived at Śrāvastī. In Śrāvastī he stayed at the Ārāma of Anāthapiṇḍada in the Jetavana.

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada heard it said that the Noble Śāriputra had passed away into final *nirvāṇa* and that his relics (*ring bsrel*) were in the hands of the Noble Ānanda. Having heard that he went to the Venerable Ānanda. Having arrived there, and honoring with his head the feet of the Venerable Ānanda, he sat down to one side. Having sat down to one side the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said this to the Venerable Ānanda: "May the Noble Ānanda hear! Since for a long time the Noble Śāriputra was to me dear, beloved, a guru and object of affection, and since he passed away into final *nirvāṇa* and his relics are in your possession would you please hand them over to me! The honor due to relics should be done to his relics! (*'phags pa śā ri'i bu ni bdag gi yun ring po nas sdug pa dang / yid du 'ong ba dang / bla ma dang / dran par bgyi ba lags na / de yongs su mya ngan las 'das te / de'i ring bsrel khyod kyi phyag na mnga' ba de dag bdag la stsol cig dang / de'i ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa bgyi*; Ta 364b.6).

Ānanda said: "Householder, because Śāriputra for a long time was to me dear, beloved, a guru and object of affection, I myself will perform the honor due to relics for his relics" (*bdag nyid de'i ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa byed do*).

To this point our text presents us with a lay claim and a monastic counter-claim, both expressed in the same terms, terms that parallel in part those found in the various claims made on the Buddha's relics in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra.* The result is a stalemate, with the relics remaining in monastic hands.

Notice too that the competing claims concern both who will have possession of the relics, and who is to perform "the honor due to relics for his relics". The Tibetan here — *ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa* — is undoubtedly a translation of a Sanskrit *śarīre śarīra-pūjā.* This Sanskrit phrase — as has already been pointed out elsewhere — has been translated in at least a half a dozen different ways by Tibetan translators. *Śarīra* in this phrase has often been translated, for example, by *rus bu* ("bone") or *sku gdung* (respect form of *rus bu*) in places where the context makes it very clear that it can only mean "body" (*lus*) or "corpse" (*ro lo*). Part of the problem is, of course, that *śarīra* in the singular means "body," but in the plural or in compound

can mean what we call "relics" or bone. But in spite of this muddle the Tibetan of our account at least makes a verbal distinction between what Cunda did as a part of Śāriputra's funeral, *ring bsrel la lus kyis mchod pa*, and what Ānanda and Anāthapiṇḍada want to do to his relics, *ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa*. It is a small, somewhat clumsy attempt to mark a distinction, but it is an important additional piece of evidence indicating that the tradition did not consider funeral activity and activity in regard to relics as the same thing.[39]

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍada went to the Blessed One. Arriving there, and honoring with his head the feet of the Blessed One, he sat down to one side. Having sat down to one side the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said this to the Blessed One: "May the Reverend hear! For a long time the Noble Śāriputra was to me dear, beloved, a guru and object of affection. His relics are in the hands of the Noble Ānanda. May the Blessed One please grant that they be given to me! I ask for the honor due to relics for his relics" (*bdag de'i ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa 'tshal lo*; Ta 365a.5).

The Blessed One then, having summoned Ānanda through a messenger, said this to him: "Ānanda, give the relics of the monk Śāriputra to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada! Allow him to perform the honors! (*de mchod pa byed du chung cig*). On account of this advantage Brahmins and householders are possessed of faith. Moreover, Ānanda, through only this there is by you neither benefit nor recompense for my teaching. Therefore you should cause to go forth, you should ordain, you should give the requisites, you should attend to the business of a monk, to them you should cause to be proclaimed as it was proclaimed, cause it to be taken up, teach it, and through only this there is by you profit and recompense for my teaching" (*kun dga' bo gzhan yang 'di tsam gyis ni khyod kyis nga'i bstan pa la phan byas pa 'am lan lon pa ma yin no / de lta bas na khyod kyis rab tu phyung zhig / bsnyen par rdzogs par gyis shig / gnas byin cig / dge slong gi ched nye bar zhog ci / de dag la yang ji ltar thon pa bzhin 'don du chug cig / 'dzin du chug cig / slobs shig dang / 'di tsam gyis na khyod kyis nga'i bstan pa la phan btags pa dang lan lon pa yin no*; Ta 365a.6).

Then the Venerable Ānanda, by the order of the Teacher, gave the relics of Śāriputra to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada — this was so since the Blessed One when formerly a Bodhisattva never violated the words of his father and mother, or of his preceptor or teacher or other such person of respect (*'di ltar bcom ldan 'das sngon byang chub sems dpar gyur par na / lan 'ga' yang yab yum dang / mkhan po dang / slob dpon dang gzhan bla ma'i gnas lta bu dag gi tshig ma bcag pas so /*; Ta 365b.1).

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada, having taken up the relics of the Venerable Śāriputra, went to his own house. Having arrived there, having placed them at a height in the best of his house (*de dag khyim gyi mchog gi nang du mthon po zhig tu bzhag nas*),[40] he, together with members of his household, together with his friends, relations and older and younger brothers undertook to honor them with lamps, incense, flowers, perfumes, garlands and unguents.

Here is something more like what our handbooks would lead us to

expect: a monk is told to hand over the relics to the laity and to stick to "the business of a monk" — ordaining, teaching, and training other monks. But it is important to note that at least narratively this was not the original monastic impulse. That impulse was to retain possession of any relics. The authority of the Buddha had to be invoked to change it. And the Buddha's explicit directive was apparently not felt by the redactor to be sufficient — he apparently felt the need to reinforce the directive by adding a kind of editorial admonition which explains Ānanda's obedience: the Buddha himself, "when formerly a Bodhisattva," always obeyed figures of authority. One may sense that this — for the redactor — was not a simple issue, and that there may have been a good deal of monastic resistance to what was being purposed. The continuation of the text would only seem to confirm this since, if it were a simple issue, we would expect the tale to end here by saying that 'everyone lived happily thereafter.' But they did not. The text so far has in fact only substituted one private cult for another. The problem of access remains and our redactor certainly had something more to say.

The multitude of men who lived in Śrāvastī heard thus that the Noble Śāriputra had passed away into final *nirvāṇa* in the village of Nalada in the country of Magadha, that the Noble Ānanda, after having obtained his relics, presented them to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, and that the latter, together with members of his household, together with his friends, relatives and acquaintances, and elder and younger brothers honored them with lamps, incense, flowers, perfumes, garlands, and unguents. Likewise Prasenajit, the king of Kośala, having heard this, went to the house of the householder Anāthapiṇḍada together with his wife Mālikā, the Kṣatriyā Varṣākārā, both Ṛṣidatta and Purāṇa, and Viśākhā, the mother of Mṛgāra, as well as many of the devout, all of them carrying the requisites for doing honor. From undertaking to honor them with the requisites of honor several of them there obtained accumulations of good qualities. But when, on another occasion, some business arose in a mountain village the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, having locked the door of his house, had gone away. But a great crowd of people came then to his house and when they saw the door locked they were derisive, abusive and critical, saying: "Seeing that the householder Anāthapiṇḍada has locked the door and gone off, he has created an obstacle to our merit" (*des bdag cag gi bsod nams kyi bar chad byas so*).

Later the householder Anāthapiṇḍada returned from that mountain village and members of his household said: "Householder, a great multitude of people carrying the requisites of honor came, but seeing the door locked they were derisive, abusive and critical saying 'Anāthapiṇḍada has created an obstacle to our merit.'"

Anāthapiṇḍada, having thought to himself "this indeed is what I must do," went to the Blessed One. Arriving there, and honoring with his head the feet of the Blessed

One, he sat down to one side. Seated to one side he said this to the Blessed One: "Reverend, when a great multitude of men who were deeply devoted to the Venerable Śāriputra came to my house carrying the requisites of honor I, on account of some business, had closed the doors and gone elsewhere. They became derisive, abusive and critical saying 'seeing that the householder Anāthapiṇḍada has locked the door and gone away, he has created an obstacle to our merit.' On that account, if the Blessed One would permit it, I would build a *stūpa* for the Noble Śāriputra in a suitably available place (*phyogs snang yal can zhig tu*). There the great multitudes of men would be allowed to do honor as they wish."

The Blessed One said: "Therefore, householder, with my permission, you should do it!"

Unless I am much mistaken the monk redactor of our text here has either himself made a particularly dexterous narrative move, or written into his account an equally dexterous move made by the monastic community at some point in time in the process of negotiations concerning access to sought after relics. Notice that the account has doubled back on itself, but with a difference. The Buddha had been presented as wanting to allow the laity to possess the relics of saintly monks. He even ordered it. The monks themselves, in the figure of Ānanda, were presented as — if not entirely enthusiastic — obedient to the wishes of the Buddha in this regard. Buddha and monk have both done their part to make access to the relics available. But alas, the narrator implies, look what happens when lay persons are allowed to keep and control access to relics. Even such a devout lay person as Anāthapiṇḍada turns the opportunity into something like a private domestic cult — "he, together with members of his household, together with his friends, relations and older and younger brothers undertook to honor them," — and, even if inadvertently, effectively restricts access to the relics in yet another way, creating an obstacle to others' merit. People complain, and it is these complaints, *not* the will of the Buddha or the monks, that justifies and accounts for yet another arrangement being devised, an arrangement which, although it will benefit the monks, was motivated — or so it appears — purely by the laity's actions and the gracious desire to remove obstacles to their merit.

Although the Blessed One said "with my permission, you should do it," Anāthapiṇḍada did not know how it should be done.

The Blessed One said: "Successively make four terraces; then make the base for

the dome; then the dome and the harmikā and the crowning pole and, having made one or two or three or four umbrellas, make up to thirteen, and the rain receptacles are to be put in place."

Although the Blessed One said "a *stūpa* of this sort is to be made," since Anāthapiṇḍada did not know if a *stūpa* of such a form was to be made for only the Noble Śāriputra or also for all Noble Ones (*'phags pa*), the monks asked the Blessed One concerning this matter, and the Blessed One said: "Householder, in regard to the *stūpa* of a Tathāgata a person should complete all parts. In regard to the *stūpa* of a Solitary Buddha the rain receptacle should not be put in place; for an Arhat there are four umbrellas; for one who does not return three; for one who returns two; for one who has entered the stream one. For ordinary good men (*so so'i skye bo dge ba rnams*; Ta 367a.4) the *stūpa* is to be made plain."

The Blessed One said "in regard to a *stūpa* for the Noble Ones it has this form, for ordinary men (*so so'i skye bo*) this," but Anāthapiṇḍada did not know by whom and in which place they were to be made. The Blessed One said: "As Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana sat when the Tathāgata was seated, just so the *stūpa* of one who has passed away into final *nirvāṇa* is also to be placed. Moreover, in regard to the *stūpas* of each individual Elder, they are to be arranged according to seniority. Those for ordinary good men are to be placed outside the monastic complex" (*ji ltar de bzhin gshegs pa bzhugs pa na / śā ri'i bu dang mo'u 'gal gyi bu dag 'dug pa de bzhin du yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa'i mchod rten yang bya'o / gzhan yang gnas brtan gnas brtan rnams kyi mchod rten ni rgan rims bzhin sbrang bar bya'o / so so'i skye bo dge ba rnams kyi ni dge 'dun gyi kun dga' ra ba'i phyi rol tu bya'o /*; Ta 367a.6).

Apart from the description of the various categories of *stūpas*, which has been treated more than once in detail,[41] perhaps the most important element of the text here is the last sentence: "Those for ordinary good men are to be placed outside the monastic complex." What this means, of course, is that all others, *all the stūpas of extra-orindary monks must be placed within the monastic complex*, or — to phrase it otherwise — under monastic control. We obviously have come full circle: lay persons might be permitted to build *stūpas*, but they must build them within a monastic complex.

Fortunately, we have some idea of who fell into the different categories. The Sanskrit text of the *Poṣadhasthāpana-vastu*, for example, says: *saṃvṛtti-saṃghaḥ katamaḥ. sarve pṛthag-jana-kalyāṇakāḥ. paramārtha-saṃghaḥ katamaḥ. śaikṣāśaikṣā aṣṭau mahā-puruṣa-pudgalāḥ; kun rdzob kyi dge 'dun gang zhe na / so so'i skye bo dge ba dang ldan pa thams cad do / don dam pa'i dge 'dun gang zhe na / slob pa dang mi slob pa'i skyes bu gang zag brgyad do/*: "What is the conventional Saṅgha? All the ordinary good men. What is the true Saṅgha? Those undergoing training and those no longer needing training, the

eight kinds of great persons."[42] In the *Divyāvadāna*, moreover, Aśoka is said to have fed three thousand monks, "one thousand of arhats, and two of those undergoing training and ordinary good men" (*yatraiko 'rhatāṃ dvau śaikṣāṇāṃ pṛthag-jana-kalyāṇakānāṃ ca*).[43] And de la Vallée Poussin has said "d'après le *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya* . . . des moines hommes du common (*pṛthagjana*) ont aussi droit au *stūpa*, à savoir le Vinayadharadharmācārya, le Vaiyāpṛtyabhikṣu, le Vertueux-bhikṣu. Comme ils ne sont pas des Āryas, il n'y a pas de lou-pan [rain-receptacle] et [le *stūpa*] est dans un lieu caché."[44] There is not a perfect agreement among these sources, but the basic point is clear — only the *stūpa* of ordinary monks, monks of little formally acknowledged religious attainment, could be erected outside the monastic complex.[45] The monks, it seems, were to keep the best very much under their jurisdiction.

The general agreement of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṃghika *Vinayas* that "ordinary" monks are worthy of a *stūpa*, and that such *stūpas* are to be placed outside the complex or "dans un lieu caché," also presents us with another instance where the Sri Lankan tradition appears to be aberrant or unrepresentative. In a passage found in the commentaries to both the *Aṅguttara* and *Dīgha Nikāyas* it is asserted that the Buddha *did not* allow *stūpas* for "ordinary" monks (*na sīlavato puthujjana-bhikkhussa*). But, to judge by the reason given to justify it, this assertion appears to be late and of Sri Lankan origin. The reason the Buddha did not allow *stūpas* for ordinary monks was: "for were a *stūpa* to be allowed for puthujjana monks there would be no room for any villages or cities in Tambapaṇṇadīpa (Ceylon), likewise in other places" (*puthujjana-bhikkhūnaṃ hi thūpe anuññāyamane tambapaṇṇadīpe gāmapaṭṭanānaṃ okāso ca na bhaveyya tathā aññesu ṭhānesu*).[46] This assertion, however, which is justified in purely Sri Lankan terms, appears not only to be in conflict with Indian *vinayas*, but at variance with what some very early Indian archaeological and epigraphical evidence indicates actually occurred.

Epigraphical evidence indicates that *stūpas* were raised for monks beginning as early as the 2nd century B.C.E., first at Sāñcī, Sonāri and Andher, then at Amarāvatī, Mathurā, Bedsā, Kanheri, and Bhājā, and probably at Pitalkhora, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and a number of other widely separated sites in India. These monks are called *āryas* ("Noble Ones"),

peṇḍavatikas ("Mendicants"), *bhikṣus, āraṇakas* ("Forest-dwellers") or *theras* ("Elders"), but never until the 6th/7th century — and only then at Kanheri — are they given titles like *arhat,* "non-returner," or any of the other titles assigned to "the eight kinds of great persons." These monks appear to have been *pṛthag-jana* monks.[47]

Not all these *stūpas* were placed outside the complex, but the larger number were either so placed or placed in isolated areas at the extremities of their sites. Several that were not had — unlike the majority of such *stūpas* — named and private individual sponsors. Fortunately the earliest case of what appears to be the textually sanctioned placement is the clearest and most certain.

The main *stūpa* at Sāñcī sits on the top of the hill. Very near it is the *stūpa* of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana. This is as it 'should be'. But *stūpa* no. 2, which held the remains of ten local monks "stands on a small terrace projecting out from the hill-side some 350 yards down its western slope." Marshall notes that "the location of the *stūpa* on this terrace is significant, since at the time when it was built there must still have been a considerable area unoccupied on the hill-top above, and it is not at first sight clear why so much trouble was taken to build up this small terrace *apart from, and below,* the other *stūpas.*" He goes on to say: ". . . whatever the achievements and fame of the dead [in *stūpa* no. 2] may have been, there must manifestly have been an objection to burying their remains side by side with those of the Buddha and his personal disciples."[48] Obviously, the arrangements at Sāñcī correspond almost exactly with the directions given in our text, and our text — now found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāsti-vāda-vinaya* — may well explain the "objection" Marshall refers to. Since Bénisti has suggested that the rail around *stūpa* no. 2 "remonte, dans sa quasi totalité, à la première moitié du IIe siècle avant notre ère," this would date some version of our text — or perhaps more importantly, the practices it refers to — to the 2nd or 3rd centuries B.C.E. And Sāñcī is not the only early site that testifies to this arrangement: the monastic cemetery at Bhājā is situated on what originally must have been the Northern perimeter of the site; at Pitalkhora what appears to be the monastic cemetery is completely removed from the main site on the other side of a deep ravine. This is enough, perhaps, to establish that the practices described in our text

are very old and widespread. But if this is what occurred in regard to ordinary monks, we still need to understand the monastic communities' interest in those monks who were extraordinary. The final section of our text will give us one good reason.

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada said: "If the Blessed One were to give permission, I will celebrate festivals (*dus ston dag*) of the *stūpa* of the Noble Śāriputra."

The Blessed One said: "Householder, with permission, you should do it!

Prasenajit, the King of Kosala, had heard how, when the householder Anāthapiṇḍada asked of the Blessed One to institute a festival of the *stūpa* of the Noble Śāriputra, the Blessed One had permitted the institution. Prasenajit, having thought "It is excellent! I too should help in that," and having the bell sounded, declared: "Sirs, city dwellers who live in Śrāvastī, and the multitudes of men who have come together from other places, hear this: 'At the time when the festival of the *stūpa* of the Venerable Śāriputra occurs, for those who have come bringing merchandise there is no tax, no toll, nor transportation fee. Therefore, they must be allowed to pass freely here!"

At that time five hundred overseas traders who had made a great deal of money from their ships arrived at Śrāvastī. They heard then how the king, sounding the bell in Śrāvastī, had ordered "whoever, at the time when the festival of the *stūpa* of the Noble Śāriputra occurs, comes bringing merchandise, for them there is no tax, no toll, nor transportation fee. Therefore, they must be allowed to pass freely here!" Some thought to themselves: "This king abides in the fruit of his own merit, but is still not satisfied with his merit. Since gifts given produce merit, why should we not give gifts, not make merit?" They, becoming devout in mind, on the occasion of that festival gave tortoise shell and precious stones and pearls, etc.

The monks, however, did not know how to proceed.

The Blessed One said: "Those gifts which are the 'first fruits' offering (*bud dung*) are to be given to the Image which Sits in the Shade of the Jambu tree. Moreover, a small part is to be put aside for the repair of the *stūpa* of Śāriputra. The remainder is to be divided by the assembly of monks — this is not for a *stūpa* of the Tathāgata, this is for a *stūpa* of Śāriputra: therefore one does not commit a fault in this case."

Perhaps because of the protestantization — or at least romanticization — of early Buddhism we are not in the habit of thinking about the economic aspects of Buddhist monastic practice. It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that the compilers of the various *vinayas* were, and our text may represent a particularly good example of how such concerns were addressed. Our text is certainly about merit, about access to importatnt religious objects and who controls it. But it is also about money, and who gets it.

There is probably nothing unique in what we see being negotiated in our text — first, as has been noted, monastic control of the relics of extraordinary monks; but then monastic rights to the offerings that the

presence of such relics generates. Notice, too, the linkage with trade and commerce. All of these things — variously linked — can be found in the histories of any number of saints' shrines in the Medieval West. We might only cite here what may be some particularly pertinent Indian parallels. In discussing the early Sufi tomb-shrines, or *dargahs*, in India, I. H. Siddiqui noted, for example, that "evidence from fourteenth-century hagiographic as well as historical literature suggests that the dargah of Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki did not take long to emerge as a popular centre of pilgrimage . . . the more popular it became, the greater seems to have been the flow of wealth to it." He notes too that "as the annual *'urs* [death anniversary] celebrated at the dargahs of the Sufi saints were the most important event of the dargah, this gave impetus to trade and commerce."[49] Still on *dargahs*, Mann has noted both that "the dargah is the medium through which the individual may perform deeds to ensure religious merit," and that "the dargah itself is a religious institution not only associated with spiritual values but also with material assets. The spiritual and material resources of the shrine create an arena where powerful local interests converge, which constantly conflict with each other. Benefits associated with the shrine thus generate intense competition over their control."[50]

We know, of course, much much less about the *stūpas* of early Buddhist monastic saints than about Sufi *dargahs*,[51] but it is not difficult to see that our text is negotiating much the same issues. And while we know very little about what was involved in the "festival" (*dus ston* = *maha*) of the *stūpa* of a dead Buddhist monastic saint, Fa-hsien's travel account would seem to suggest that — especially in regard to Śāriputra — such festivals were widespread and annual in the late 4th/early 5th century.

> Wherever monks live," he says, "they build stupas in honor of the saints Sariputra, Maudgalaputra and Ananda . . . . A month after the summer retirement, all devout families collect offerings for the monks . . . while the monks hold a great assembly to expound the Law. The assembly at an end, they offer all manner of incense and flowers at the stupa of Sariputra, and keep the lamps there burning throughout the night. Actors are hired to perform a play in which Sariputra, who was originally a Brahman goes to Buddha to ask for ordination. The lives of Maudgalaputra and Kasyapa are also performed in this way.[52]

The monastic interest in the *stūpas* of saints, as opposed to *stūpas* of the Buddha, may very well be explained — at least in part — by the

fact that they in particular were for the monks "material assets" and "material resources." Establishing this point may in fact be the *raison d'être* of our entire account.

Our account ends with a statement that acknowledges and plays off of one of the most widely attested and deeply anchored principles of the economy of Buddhist monastic organizations: what is given to a *stūpa* belongs *inalienably* to that *stūpa*. We need only cite two expressions of this principle from two widely different sorts of sources. Twice in the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga* we find the following statement:

> If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order [*saṃghassa*] for another (part of the) Order or for a shrine [*cetiyassa*], there is an offense of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine [*cetiyassa*] for another shrine or for an Order or for an individual [*puggalassa*], there is an offense of wrong-doing, etc.[53]

There can be very little doubt that *cetiya*, "shrine," refers here to *stūpas* of the Buddha, whatever else it might include, and no doubt that the statement asserts the inalienable character of property "apportioned" to such a *stūpa*. But perhaps even stronger still is the expression of the same principle found in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, an early Mahāyāna text. The passage in question first allows under certain conditions — if the *stūpa* falls into disrepair, and the *Saṅgha* has abundant resources — that the property belonging to the *Saṅgha* can be used for the *stūpa*, but then goes on immediately to insist that the reverse cannot occur under any circumstances:

> Kāśyapa, even if the property of the *stūpa* were to be however large it is not to be transferred to the local *Saṅgha* or the *Saṅgha* of the four directions by the supervising monk. What is the reason for that? That which is given to the *stūpa* by those with devotion and great faith — even so much as a single fringe of cotton cloth — that is itself a shrine for the world together with the gods. How much more so is that the case in regard to precious stones and things of value" (*dad cing dang ba mang po dag gis mchod rten la phul ba ni tha na ras kyi kha tshar gcig tsam gang yin pa de yang lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi mchod rten yin na rin po che 'am / rin po cher smos pa dag lta smos kyang ci dgos*)[54]

Property belonging to the *stūpa* is, then, in monastic rule, both inviolable and inalienable, and itself 'sacred.' This does not leave much room to move, but the *vinaya*-master who recorded or put together the account of Śāriputra's relics seems concerned to negotiate this particular strait.

The final episode in the account starts with the gift of valuable property (*dung dang / nor bu dang / mu tig la sogs pa*) made by rich merchants during the festival of the *stūpa* of Śāriputra, and the monks not knowing what should be done with them (*dge slong dag gis ji ltar bsgrub pa mi shes nas*).[55] Notice that the rule this situation gives rise to both begins with and ends with the established rule that what is given to the *stūpa* belongs to the *stūpa* — but here, of course, a distinction is introduced. The Buddha is first made to say "those gifts which are the 'first fruit' offerings are to be given to the Image which Sits in the Shade of the Jambu Tree," *bud dung gang dag yin pa de dag ni shing 'dzam bu'i grim ma na bzhugs pa'i sku gzugs la dbul bar bya'o. bud dung,* one of two important terms here has given me, at least, a lot of trouble, and I owe the suggestion which I think successfully solves the problem to my former student and colleague Yael Bentor. She noticed what is certainly the same term in Bu-ston's *mchod rten la mchod pa byas pa'i phan yon,* but there it is spelled not *bud dung* but *phud dud,*[56] and indeed Jäschke's entries show that the orthography of what seems to be the basic form is unsettled: *phud, phu dug, phu dud. bud dung* appears to be yet another variant. Jäschke defines *phud* as "a thing set apart, used particularly of the first fruits of the field;" he cites *rdo phud* and *sa phud* as "an offering of stones or earth, when a house is first built," and gives the most general meaning as "initiatory present, e.g. the first produce of a work, that has been committed to one."[57] The "first fruits" of the merchants' labor, then, are to be given to the Buddha — i.e The Image Which Sits in the Shade of the Jambu Tree. This image — one inscribed Kuṣān exemplar of which was discovered at Sāñcī — was apparently a specific type which represented the Buddha as a bodhisattva during his first youthful spontaneous meditation. It is also referred to as the recipient of specific property elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.*[58]

Apart from this 'first-fruits' offering, and a "small part . . . put aside for the repair of the *stūpa* of Śāriputra," the remainder — which having been given to the *stūpa* should have continued to belong to it — "is to be divided by the assembly of monks." This is a significant departure from established rule or monastic law, but is justified by introducing a distinction which plays off that very same rule: "This [all of what has been given] is not for a *stūpa* of the Tathāgata, this is for

a *stūpa* of Śāriputra: therefore one does not commit a fault in this case:" *de de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten gyi ma yin gyi / śā ri'i bu'i mchod rten gyi yin te / de lta bas na 'di la 'gyod par mi bya'o.* Guṇaprabha appears to have seen — as we will see — that the rule framed here in terms of Śāriputra's *stūpa* has, in fact, categorical application. He says: "That which is given to the *stūpa* of a disciple (*nyan thos kyi mchod rten*) belongs indeed to his fellow-monks" — *tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa* = *sabrahmacārin* — the same category of people for whom monks are obligated to perform funerals (*tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa shi ba'i lus la mchod pa bya'o*).

It is not hard to see that the legal distinction affirmed in our account could have had considerable economic implications for monks who had no access to, or claim on, property given to "a *stūpa* of the Tathāgata," and could easily account for at least a part of the impulse that produced what Fa-hsien appears to have seen: "Wherever monks live they build stupas in honour of the saints Sariputra, Maudgalaputra and Ananda . . . ." Such *stūpas,* and their associated "festivals," may have been an important part of the monk's bread-and-butter.[59] But as important, perhaps, as making these economic connections is what our discussions may tell us about the 'style' of Buddhist monastic codes and the legal minds that produced them.

If the readings of these *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* accounts that are suggested above are even remotely correct, then the world we have been reconnoitering — the world of monastic law — does not appear to be a simple one of fables and fiction or half remembered 'historical' accounts, but a complex one of carefully constructed 'cases' in which concerns of power, access and economics were being or had been negotiated. We have seen two such cases, one concerned with whether or not lay persons could participate in monastic funerals, the other dealing with the question of whether or not lay persons could possess or have control over the relics of extraordinary monastic saints. Since, it seems, these cases may be neither mindless fables nor historical records, but rather the juridical decisions — delivered in canonical form — of an Order's *vinaya* redactors they appear to be more than anything like certain systems of formal Buddhist philosophy: they work from certain presuppositions; they establish general principles; introduce category distinctions; and negotiate exceptions. They do not

— or only very rarely — establish definitive positions. And this, indeed, may be a characteristic of all successful law.

Notice that in our cases there is not — as there was not on so many points of formal Buddhist doctrine — a single, definitive position, even within one Order. In our first case, for example, the answer to the question 'can lay persons participate in monastic funerals?' is first, and most generally, no — that is an obligation and prerogative of fellow-monks; then 'maybe,' under certain circumstances — it occurred once when a lay-sister was able to assert an ecclesiastically recognized relationship between herself and the dead monk. But no general definitive statement was made in this instance that would establish it as a rule. In our second question 'can lay persons possess, or control access, or participate in the cult of, the relics of extraordinary monks?' the answer is again fluid — first no; then definitively yes; then sort of, under certain conditions of monastic control.

Considerations of this kind would seem to have at least two effects: they would seem to doom the endless series of papers 'on *the* Buddhist position on this or that' to a not undeserved oblivion; and they would make in yet another way "relating the canonical *vinaya* to actual practice in diverse contexts more complex than has generally been admitted by students of Buddhism." If *vinaya* cases are neither fables nor historical accounts, but rather the forms that *vinaya*-masters chose narratively to frame the issues that concerned them, then they do provide us a record of such concerns and the various legal attempts to resolve them. They do not, however, provide any direct evidence for what actually occurred.

These *vinaya* cases also can be — like all legal cases — arcane. They are embedded in, and presuppose, an accumulated body of related cases. The significance of one case often assumes a knowledge of other cases. The conclusion of the account of the relics of Śāriputra, for example: "The remainder is to be divided by the assembly of monks — this is not for a *stūpa* of the Tathāgata, this is for a *stūpa* of Śāriputra: therefore one does not commit a fault in this case," does not by itself make a great deal of sense. Its significance requires a knowledge of the general principles stated elsewhere that 'what is given to a *stūpa* belongs to the *stūpa*.' Again, unless one knows the sets of rules governing monastic funerals given elsewhere, the account

of the funeral of the monk Kālodāyin seems like just a curious story, and what is being negotiated is not at all evident. In some instances, in fact, one case will explicitly refer to another.

One of the clearest instances of such an explicit cross-reference in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that I know occurs in an important case — important both for Buddhist monastic law and 'Hindu' law — involving inheritance. The case to which the reference is made concerns a monk named Upananda.[60] Upon his death he left a large estate. Government officials got wind of the estate and while the monks were away performing the funeral ceremonies (*tam ādahane saṃskārya*) they sealed Upananda's room with the King's seal (*layanaṃ rājamudrāmudritam*). The Buddha then sends Ānanda to the King with a series of questions designed to determine if the King had had any specific relationship with the dead monk. The King says no, and is made to assent to the principle that the text puts into the mouth of the Buddha: "Great King, the affairs of the house of householders are one thing; those of renouncers quite another . . . the possessions fall to the fellow-monks of Upananda" (*pṛthaṅ mahārāja gṛhiṇāṃ gṛhakāryāṇi pṛthak pravrajitānām . . . sabrahmacāriṇām eṣa lābhaḥ prāpadyate*).

This case occurs in the *Cīvara-vastu* and so does the case that refers to it, but they are separated by more than twenty pages treating unrelated matters. The case that refers to the first case also treats the question of inheritance. Here the estate at issue was left by a wealthy layman who had started to enter the order, had had his head shaved, and had begun to undertake the rules of training, but had fallen sick. Though attended to by the monks, he died. He, however, before he died had made a 'will' and sent it to the Jetavana (*tatas tena maraṇakālasamaye sarvaṃ santakasvāpateyaṃ patrābhilekhyaṃ kṛtvā jetavane preṣitam*). It is, of course, the reference to the written 'will' which makes this case so interesting from the point-of-view of Hindu law, where such written instruments are very rarely attested.[61] In any case, government officials again hear of the estate and report it to the King, noting that the deceased was *aputra*, without son or heir. But the King does not contest the rights to inherit and simply says — referring to the first case:

Even in the absence of a written document I did not obtain the possessions of the Noble Upananda, how much less will I obtain such goods when there is a written document" (*āryopanandasantakam eva mayā apatrābhilikhitaṃ na pratilabdhaṃ prāg eva patrābhilikhitaṃ pratilapsye*).[62]

Here, then, not only does one case explicitly refer to another case as a partial precedent, but we see as well — from the Buddhist side — Buddhist monastic law playing off and negotiating with 'secular' law. There are, in fact, a number of allusions to, and — I suspect — paraphrases of, secular law in this *vinaya*.

It is, in short, beginning to appear that Buddhist *vinayas* may represent a far more sophisticated and a far more artificial system of thought than has here-to-fore been recognized. Ironically, this may have made canonical *vinayas* even less accessible to ordinary monks, and — as if their sheer size were not enough — even less useful for the governance of actual behavior: we arrive again at the 'summaries' and 'handbooks,' and a quick look at Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* will not only introduce us to one such Mūlasarvāstivādin summary, it will, in fact, allow us to summarize much of what has been discussed.

We have for the life of Guṇaprabha the usual pastiche of biographical bits from late sources and colophons. Dates between the 5th and 7th century have been suggested for him and at least two Tibetan colophons connect him with the reign of Harṣavardhana (606—47 C.E.), one of which also says he was Harṣa's "preceptor" — a tradition Tāranātha also repeats. He may have been from Mathurā, and is mentioned by both I-Ching and Tāranātha in the same breath with some pretty heavy-duty company: Dignāga, Sthiramati, Bhavya, Dharmakīrti, et al.[63]

Bu-ston refers to Guṇaprabha as "a great authority in the Vinaya of the Ārya-mūlasarvāstivādins," and twice cites his *Vinaya-sūtra* as a model of the kind of treatise that is "condensing excessively large (portions of) scripture" or of those which "render the contents of many different parts of scripture, taken together." The *Vinaya-sūtra* is, in fact, the only work on *vinaya* that Bu-ston treats in any detail.[64]

A Sanskrit text of the *Vinaya-sūtra* has come down to us in a Tibetan transliteration, a single manuscript of which was discovered and photographed by R. Sāṅkṛityāyana at the Ṣhalu monastery.

Sāṅkṛityāyana also photographed a manuscript of the auto-commentary on the text, but while the text of the *sūtra* appears to be complete, the manuscript of the commentary is described as "mostly fragmentary," although it is in an "ancient Indian script." So far only the first chapter of the Sanskrit text of both *sūtra* and commentary have been published, but both are available in their entirety in Tibetan translation.[65]

Looking even quickly at Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* will tell us at least two things: it will tell us whether an eminent early medieval *vinaya*-master thought any of what we have been discussing was worthy of being included in what appears to have been intended as a comprehensive handbook or summary of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; and it will tell us something about the form in which what we have been discussing may have reached a significant number of medieval monks. In regard to the first of these questions the answer is, on one level, simple and straight-forward: Guṇaprabha treats *both* monastic funerals *and* the questions concerning monastic relics. In fact he ends his *sūtra* with the treatment of three spheres of monastic ritual, in the following order: monastic funerals; activity in regard to *stūpas*; and activity in regard to images. This grouping might well suggest that for Guṇaprabha monastic funeral ritual had the same importance as ritual connected with both *stūpas* and images.[66] But what Guṇaprabha chose to exclude is as interesting as what he included, and is connected, of course, with the form in which he presented what we have seen in the canonical text of this *Vinaya*. Nothing conveys a better sense of this than a translation of the relevant sections, which I give here after the Tibetan text from the Taipei reprint of the Derge edition. The translation, again, is tentative: Guṇaprabha's style is — in keeping with his genre — extremely terse, and the commentary is not always helpful. I have had, moreover, access only to the Derge text.[67]

Rules Governing Monastic Funerals and Relics in Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra*
(Derge, Bstan-'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 99a.1—.6)

tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa shi ba'i lus la mchod pa bya'o.

de bsreg par bya'o — gal te srog chags dang bcas pa'i rma med pa nyid yin no — so sor brtags pas nges par bya'o.

brko ba 'am chu klung la bskur ro. mi rung na tshang tshing gi dbus su gzhag go — glo g-yas pas bsnyal te mgo byang phyogs su bstan no — sngas su rtsva'i chun po gzhug go — rtsva dag gam lo ma dag gis g-yogs so.

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the "Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya"*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 22:1 (1994:Mar.) p.31

chos mnyan pa dang yon bshad pa dag bya'o.
reg pa dag gis gos dang bcas te khrus bya'o — gzhan dag gis ni rkang lag bkru'o.
mchod rten la phyag byas te 'jug par bya'o.

mchod rten ni rnam pa gnyis te: gtsang khang can nyid dang ka ba lta bu nyid do.
da rab tu byung ba rnams la 'os pa nyid de — gal te dge ba yin na'o.
sangs rgyas rnams kyi rnam pa thams cad do — rnam pa ni bang rim bzhi dang 'dab ma dang bum pa dang pu shu dang srog shing dang gdugs bcu gsum dang char gab dag go.
rang sangs rgyas rnams kyi ni char gab med ba'o.
nyan thos rnams kyi ni 'bras bu'i tshad dag gis de'i gdugs gcig lhag pa'o.
de bzhin gshegs pa'i phyogs kyi yul nyid du gang ru de dag gnas par gyur pa'i phyogs der de'i 'khor du bya'o — 'di la rgan rims su mi bya bar mi bya'o.
so so'i skye bo rnams kyi ni byi bo'o — de dag ni dge 'dun gyi kun dga' ra ba'i phyi rol tu bya'o.
'phags pa la ni mchod rten gyi dus ston rigs so.
nyan thos kyi mchod rten la phul ba ni tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa rnams dbang ba nyid yin no.
mu tig dag ni bstan pa bzhin bya'o.
bud dung dag ni sangs rgyas la dbul lo — de las zhig ral bcos ba'i phyir gzhag par bya'o — mchod par rung ba nyid kyang ngo.

Honor is to be done to the body of a deceased fellow-monk.
It is to be cremated — if there is an absence of wounds containing living things — it should be made certain by examining each one.
It should be consigned to a grave[68] or a river — if that is not suitable it will be deposited in the middle of a thicket — laying it on its right side its head will face North — on a bolster bunches of grass will be placed — it should be covered with grass or leaves.
Both a recitation of Dharma and an assigning of the reward (to the deceased) is to be made.[69]
Those who had contact with the corpse should bathe themselves together with their robes — others will wash feet and hands.
Having venerated the *stūpa*, they should go in.

There are two types of *stūpa*: that within a chamber[70] and that which is like a pillar (i.e. free-standing).
Now in regard to renunciants that one is worthy (of a *stūpa*) — if he is meritorious.
For Buddhas a *stūpa* has all its parts — the parts are four terraces, the petal, the dome, the enclosure, the crowning pole, thirteen umbrellas, and the rain receptacle.[71]
For Solitary Buddhas there is no rain receptacle.
For disciples there are one or more umbrellas depending on the measure of their achievement.
When the spots where they are lodged are within an area that is a Tathāgata's spot they should encircle that[72] — in this case the order of seniority must be observed.
For ordinary men a *stūpa* is plain (i.e. without any crowning members) — they are to be placed outside the monastic complex.

In regard to Noble Ones a festival for the *stūpa* is necessary.

That which is given to the *stūpa* of a disciple belongs indeed to his fellow-monks. Pearls are to be made thus for the Teaching.

The initiatory respect offerings will be for the Buddha — from that will be put aside what is required for repairs — that is also suitable for costs of worship.

What is first and most immediately obvious here is that we have shifted worlds. We are no longer in the leisurely world of the monastic jurist where narrative cases can be slowly built up, concerns negotiated, flexibility allowed — even deliberate ambiguity. We have moved to the world of the disciplinarian who tacks up lists on walls. There is no room here for contingency. What has above all else been lost in the move is any consideration of the laity.

Guṇaprabha had, presumably, at least three canonical passages to draw on for rules regarding monastic funerals: those found in the *Cīvara-vastu*, those found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu*, and the account of the funeral of the Monk Kālodāyin. A glance at the *Kṣudraka-vastu* will immediately show that Guṇaprabha has faithfully reproduced the rules found there, entirely shorn of their narrative frame.[73] Although he alludes to them in a much earlier section,[74] here in the more relevant section he ignores the rules found in the *Cīvara-vastu*. Most significantly, however, he completely ignores the account of the funeral of Kālodāyin, the one text that allows for some lay participation in such ritual events. Obviously Guṇaprabha had to make some choices, *but they did not have to take this form.*

Notice too that his selections of material concerning *stūpas* have the same result. He is once again depending closely on the account of Śāriputra's relics now found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu*. But his presentation entirely excludes any reference to the frame-story or case that had been built up and, thereby, entirely excludes any place for the laity. Regardless, then, of the care and flexiblity with which the canonical jurist might have considered an issue, it is more than likely that the majority of monks received and knew that issue in a much more rigid form. It is also not impossible that Guṇaprabha's selections — and the consequent exclusion of the laity — are related to other changes that led to a precipitous decline in the number of lay donors clearly visible in Buddhist inscriptions dating from the 5th/6th centuries.[75]

In terms of more specific details it is worth noting that — like his source text — Guṇaprabha appears to maintain, and therefore confirm, a clear distinction between funereal activity and activity in regard to *stūpas*, although his wording is somewhat cryptic. In the *Kṣudraka-vastu* the discussion of a monastic funeral ends with the Buddha specifying what should presumably form its last moment: "The *stūpa* is to be worshipped" (*mchod rten la phyag 'tshal bar bya'o*). The *stūpa* in question here is almost certainly that of the Buddha — however anachronistic this might be — since the discussion itself has made no reference to building one for the deceased. Guṇaprabha adds a clause and thereby appears to emphasize the closure: "Having venerated the *stūpa*, they (the monks) should go in" — presumably, into the *vihāra*. The distinction also seems to be marked in another way. Guṇaprabha opens by saying "Honor is to be done to the body of a deceased fellow-monk," without any qualification: all monks are to get a funeral. But, significantly, all are not to get a *stūpa*. When he talks about *stūpas* he adds a qualification: "Now in regard to renunciants (*pravrājin*) that one is worthy (of a *stūpa*) — if he is meritorious." The commentary here on *da rab tu byung ba rnams la 'os pa nyid de — gal te dge ba yin na'o* fleshes it out thus: "When it is said 'now in regard to renunciants that one is worthy,' this refers to a *stūpa*. But it might be asked if this is so for all. For that reason it is said: 'if he is meritorious' " (*de rab tu byung ba rnams la 'os pa nyid do zhes bya ba ni mchod rten de'o / ci thams cad la 'am zhe na de'i phyir / gal te dge ba yin na'o zhes bya ba smos te*).[76] Therefore, though all monks got a funeral, only the "meritorious" got a *stūpa*, and funeral and *stūpa* were determined by two quite different sets of considerations.

Guṇaprabha also confirms other distinctions. He confirms that *stūpas* for "ordinary men . . . are to be placed outside the monastic complex." The text of the *sūtra* has here only *so so'i skye bo*, or simply *pṛthagjana*, but both it and the text of its canonical source use *so so'i skye bo* and *so so'i skye bo dge ba* = *pṛthag-jana-kalyāṇa* interchangeably and are always referring to a category of monks. This is of note because it suggests that the masses of mostly anonymous mortuary *stūpas* and deposits which so often and so early transformed

"les ensembles monastiques en champs d'urnes funéraires" were those of lay persons. This is confirmed in the very rare cases in which such deposits are inscribed.[77]

Guṇaprabha confirms as well, by clearly stating it, that "festivals" were required for the *stūpas* of all *āryas* — not just Śāriputra. In fact he states as a rule what is only implied in his source text, which refers to Śāriputra alone. The same applies to the question of ownership: what is, again, only implied in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* Guṇaprabha states as an explicit rule: "That which is given to the *stūpa* of a disciple belongs indeed to his fellow-monks." Here too the auto-commentary fills this out: *de la ras dang snam bu dang rdzas gang yang rnam pa gzhan gang dag phul ba de dag ni dge slong rnams kyis bgo bar bya'o*, "Here whatever cotton cloth and woolen cloth and object of possession (*dravya*), and any other type of thing that is given, that is to be divided by the monks (Zu 271a.3)."

Finally, Guṇaprabha both confirms that 'first fruit' offerings go to the Buddha, but adds as well a stipulation not found in his immediate source text which may well have been intended to 'correct' it. The account of Śāriputra's relics seems to imply that pearls (*mu tig*) were to be divided among the monks. But, as Guṇaprabha certainly knew,[78] this runs counter to other rulings in his *Vinaya* which specifically exclude pearls from such distribution, or indicate that if pearls are divided one share is "for the Buddha" (*ekaṃ buddhāya*). That share, moreover, is to be used to plaster the Perfume Chamber (*yo buddhasya bhāgas tena gandhakuṭyām pralepaṃ dadata*).[79] In his *Sūtra* Guṇaprabha says that pearls are to go to the Teaching (*śāsana*), but in his commentary he specifically says: " 'A coat of plaster is to be given to the Perfume Chamber,' this is the meaning of the words 'to be made thus for the Teaching' " (*dri gtsang khang gi zhal zhal du bya'o zhes bstan pa bzhin du bya'o zhes bya ba'i don to*; Zu 271a.4). It is, of course, possible that a part of Guṇaprabha's insistence here is related to the fact that — to judge by Buddhist inscriptions — the Perfume Chamber was becoming an increasingly prominent part of Buddhist monastic institutions.[80] But regardless of his motivations, he is obviously trying to bring some order or system out of his source material. This last point leads us to the first of our final and more general observations.

As we have seen, in regard to canonical pasages on monastic funerals Guṇaprabha had to make some choices; in regard to the disposition of pearls he had to impose some order or consistency: Guṇaprabha had to do both because the compilers of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* appear to have done neither. This *Vinaya* is not only large, it is messy. We have — to stick to our first example — at least three different formulations of rules governing monastic funerals in three different sections of the same *Vinaya.* Though basically similar, they are not the same and there is significant variation or development from one to another. It is difficult, given the presuppositions about how the Buddhist monastic codes were constructed to account for this. But it seems at least possible that 1) each section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* was organized, transmitted and used by a different group within the same Order; or 2) this *Vinaya* never underwent the same processes of revision and systemization that some — if not all — other *vinayas* did. Certainly in comparison to the Pāli *Vinaya* the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is terribly untidy. Sylvain Lévi noticed this long ago, and made his usual insightful observation: The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya's* "bouillonnement tumultueux et chaotique," he said, "contraste avec la régularité sèche et froide du Vinaya pāli. Mais," he added, "l'ordonnance correcte et rigoureuse des matières marque, plutôt que la confusion des genres, un stage avancé de l'art ou de la technique."[81] Moreover, the presence — repeatedly noted — of some seemingly very old material in this *Vinaya* may also suggest that it was never revised.[82]

There are, however, other inconsistencies in this *Vinaya* which seem to reflect something that goes beyond form or redactional history, and points to a fissure that seems to appear throughout the history of Indian Buddhism — one side of the line has been clearly acknowledged and much studied, the other not. Much in Indian Buddhism seems, in fact, to project a decidedly mixed message in regard to the body — certainly the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* does. Everybody knows, for example, what the last words of the Buddha were supposed to have been: "All compounded things are by nature liable to change." But much less attention has been paid to what was — according to an equally good or equally bad authority — his last act. The Mūlasarvāstivādin *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra,* which still forms a

part of its *Vinaya*, says that immediately before the Buddha's death:

> There was this, however, that remained to be done by the Tathāgata, namely, taking pity on this final gathering.
>
> Then the Blessed One, having removed to one side the upper robe from his body, addressed the monks: 'Behold, monks, the body of the Tathāgata! Look closely, monks, at the body of the Tathāgata.'
>
> (*api tu karaṇīyam etat tathāgatena yathāpi tat paścimāṃ janatāṃ anukampamānaḥ. atha bhagavān svakāyād uttarāsaṅgam ekānte vivṛtya bhikṣūn āmantrayate: avalokayata bhikṣavas tathāgatasya kāyam vyavalokayaia bhikṣavas tathāgatasya kāyaṃ*).[83]

An equally startling display of bodies occurs in the account of the funeral of Mahāprajāpatī. After the bodies of Mahāprajāpatī and the five hundred nuns who died with her are set down at the place for cremation, the text says:

> The Blessed One then, having laid aside the upper robes from the bodies of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and those five hundred nuns, spoke to the monks: 'Look, monks! Although Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and these five hundred nuns have lived for a hundred and twenty years there are no wrinkles or white hair on their bodies — they look like girls of sixteen."
>
> (*de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis skye dgu'i bdag mo chen mo go'u ta mi dang / dge slong ma lnga brgya po dag gi lus las bla gos phud nas / dge slong rnams la bka' stsal pa / dge slong dag skye dgu'i bdag mo chen mo go'u ta mi dang / dge slong ma lnga brgya po 'di dag lo brgya nyi shu long yang / lus la gnyer ma dang skra dkar med cing / bu mo lo bcu drug lon pa lta bu la ltos* / Ta 172a.3).

Notice that both exhibitions are intended for and explicitly directed towards monks. They are apparently meant for their edification, not that of a group of admiring lay devotees. They both, moreover, reflect a strong positive value placed on holy bodies.

That there be some ambivalence in regard to the bodies of the founders of the monastic communities may not be too surprising. But it is precisely for that reason that it is important to note that the ambivalence appears to be much wider, and appears to arise in regard to ordinary Buddhist bodies as well.

One pole of the monastic attitude to the body — the pole that is widely acknowledged in the scholarly literature — can be documented within this *Vinaya* itself. In one of the infrequent passages in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* which refers to 'mental cultivation' we find:

> The Blessed One said: 'The practice of sitting is called yoga (*niṣadyā ucyate yogaḥ*). Monks, you should observe that this body (*kāya*), from the soles of the feet upward,

from the hair of the head downward, is bounded by skin, and as it stands, as it obtains, is full of various sorts of impurity. There are in this body hairs of the head, body hairs, nails, teeth, dirt, filth, skin, flesh, bone, sinew, veins, kidneys, spleen, lung, intestines, mesentery, stomach, abdomen, bladder, liver, shit, tears, sweat, phlegm, grease, lymph, marrow, fat, bile, mucus, pus, blood and piss. The body thus is to be observed.[84]

Passages of this sort are, of course, widely passed off as 'good Buddhism,' and they certainly give expression to one important part of what appears to have been a very complex attitude. What has been much less frequently noted, though, are other expressions of other aspects of this attitude. In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, it may be these other aspects that are more frequently found. Certainly alongside passages which describe the body as full of dirt, filth, shit and piss we find as well elaborate rules specifying that it is to be washed, anointed, carefully handled and reverently honored. Its 'parts' too are to be carefully preserved. Both types of passages must be considered.

Finally, we need at least to ask again how these 'parts' were thought of. We have seen above that both texts and inscriptions suggest that they were thought to contain or be enlivened by the spiritual qualities of the person they belonged to — that they were alive. There is further confirmation of this in yet another text from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and citing it will allow us to end as we began — with a story. The story is a curious pendant to the equally curious case given in the Pāli *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga* under *Pācittiya* LII. Both involve the destruction by an angry monk of *stūpas* which groups of nuns had erected for the remains of the bodies of deceased persons honored by their communities. The text of the Mūlasarvāstivādin case says that when the nuns heard that the *stūpa* had been destroyed they said: "Our brother beginning from today is, indeed, dead" (*bdag cag gi ming po deng gdod shi ba lta zhes*), and wept.[85] The redactors do not comment on this expression. Perhaps we would do well to follow their lead.

ENDNOTES

[1] See B. Faure, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy. A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton: 1991) esp. 149—208; R. H. Sharf, "The Idolization of Enlightenment: On the Mummification of Ch'an Masters in Medieval China," *History*

of Religions 32 (1992) 1—31; W. M. Bodiford, "Zen in the Art of Funerals: Ritual Salvation in Japanese Buddhism," *History of Religions* 32 (1992) 146—64; cf. K. Shinohara, "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories," in P. Granoff & K. Shinohara, eds., *Monks and Magicians. Religious Biographies in Asia* (Oakville: 1988) 119—228; J. Hubbard, "Chinese Reliquary Inscriptions and the San-chieh-chiao," *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.2 (1991) 253—280; etc.

2 I am particularly aware of the weakness of the work on Indian materials since I wrote it — see G. Schopen, "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 1—39 [I here thank my friend Richard Hayes for having drawn so much undeserved attention to this piece that it justified another]; Schopen, "An Old Inscription from Amarāvatī and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries," *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.2 (1991) 281—329; cf. Schopen, "Monks and the Relic Cult in the Mahāparinibbānasutta: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism," in K. Shinohara & G. Schopen, *From Benares to Beijing. Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua* (Oakville: 1991) 187—201; Schopen, "Burial Ad Sanctos and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism," *Religion* 17 (1987) 193—225; Schopen, "*Stūpa* and *Tīrtha*: Tibetan Mortuary Practices and an Unrecognized Form of Burial Ad Sanctos at Buddhist Sites in India," *Buddhist Forum II. Papers in Honour of D. S. Ruegg*, T. Skorupski, ed. (London: 1993) in the press.

3 So — in order of citation — M. Lalou, "Notes sur la décoration des monastères bouddhiques," *Revues des arts asiatiques* 5.3 (1930) 183; J. Przyluski, "Fables in the Vinaya-Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādin School," *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 5 (1929) 5; E. Huber, "Le roi kaniṣka dans le vinaya des mūlasarvāstivādins," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 14 (1914) 18; S. Lévi, "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme. comment s'est constitué le canon sacré," in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris: 1937) 78, 84, 78.

4 The most detailed and useful 'table of contents' that I know for this *Vinaya* is to be found in T. Skorupski, *A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kanjur* (Tokyo: 1985) 1—28, which follows the division of the text according to the types and numbers of offense. It is, however, not cross-referenced to other editions.

5 C. Hallisey, "Apropos the Pāli Vinaya as a Historical Document: A Reply to Gregory Schopen," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 15 (1991) 206—07.

6 To my knowledge very little work has been done on Mūlasarvāstivādin summaries or handbooks of the *Vinaya*. The *Ārya-mūlasarvāstivādi-śrāmaṇera-kārika*, sometimes attributed to Nāgārjuna, has been translated into English: L. Dagpa, et al., *The Discipline of the Novice Monk* (Mussoorie: 1975), and works of this sort designed for novices may be a very good place to start (R. E. Buswell in speaking of Korean monasticism says, for example, that a text entitled *Admonitions to Beginners* was "the first text read by every incoming postulant," and that this text meant for novices is "the basic handbook of Korean monastic regulations and lifestyle" — *The Zen Monastic Experience. Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton: 1992) 191, 80). A start has also been made on what appears to be a very promising genre of texts for Tibetan monasticism, the so-called *bca' yig*, "the name for a document outlining the basic principles, institutions, roles, and rules governing the organization and operation of a Tibetan monastic community" — see T. Ellingson, "Tibetan

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the "Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya"*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 22:1 (1994:Mar.) p.31

Monastic Constitutions: The Bca' Yig," in L. Epstein & R. F. Sherburne, eds., *Reflections on Tibetan Culture. Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie* (Lewiston: 1990) 205—29, which contains a short discussion of the relationship of such *bca' yig* to the canonical *vinaya.*

[7] Cited from F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: 1953) 181, who is correcting *Mahāvastu* iii 104.7; see also G. P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: 1937) i 589—90, under Kāḷudāyī Thera.

[8] It concerns a brahmin who gains control of a non-human-being (*mi ma yin pa*) by means of *mantras,* hooks him to a cart, and drives around Śrāvastī. Kālodāyin sees the brahmin get off his cart to have a piss and — to allow the *mi ma yin pa* to escape — causes the brahmin to continue to piss interminably through his supernatural powers (*byin gyis brlabs nas*). Such stories — sometimes crude, but always funny — are a significant part of *vinaya* literature which has been sadly overlooked.

[9] In the present paper I have sometimes used this Derge edition — *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition,* ed., A. W. Barber (Taipei: 1991) — which is the only complete edition now available to me; and sometimes *The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur* (Leh: 1979), only part of which I now have access to. This in itself should warn the reader that the translations presented here are not based on a critically established text and are therefore tentative in this regard (the immense labor that will be required to establish such a text can be seen in H. Eimer, *Rab Tu 'Byuṅ Ba'i Gzi. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins,* Teil I und II (Asiatische Forschungen Band 82) (Wiesbaden: 1983). The translations are, however, tentative in other ways as well. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in both Sanskrit and Tibetan is not only huge, but largely unstudied. It is written in an elliptical, often almost colloquial style, bristles with uncommon constructions and obscure or virtually unknown lexical items, and is haunted by textual uncertainties. In dealing with these texts I have frequently felt that I was not — to use a favorite phrase of J. W. de Jong — "equal to the task." To at least partially off-set the quality of the translations I have felt it necessary to cite the original more often than I would have liked, and certainly more often than will be convenient for many readers. I have, however, tried to keep textual and lexical notes to a minimum — they will have to wait until another time.

[10] *bdag nyid chen po 'di'i rjes gcod pa 'ga' zhig phyis 'ong grang snyams nas* is ambiguous; it might also mean "thinking that perhaps someone coming by later would obliterate the tracks of the Eminent One."

[11] *rkang pa gnyis la phag 'tshal nas*; this is an interesting anthropomorphic turn of phrase not uncommonly applied — as here — to *stūpas* in this *Vinaya*; for some instances in Sanskrit see *Adhikaraṇa-vastu* (Gnoli) 70.12 . . . *tasmin stūpe samāropitam tīvreṇa ca prasādena pādayor nipatya . . . ; Saṅghabheda-vastu* (Gnoli) i 161: . . . *yāvat paśyati stūpam . . . pūjāṃ kṛtvā pādayor nipatya*; see also *Śayanāsaṇa-vastu* (Gnoli) 32.18 where the same expression is applied not to a *stūpa* but a pot (*kumbha*) containing the bones of a pratyekabuddha.

[12] Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 3—14.

[13] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 115.8.

[14] *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tog) Ta 358b.7—359a.4.

[15] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 127.10; (Tog) Ga 138b.4; Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 9.

[16] Schopen, *From Benares to Beijing,* 187—201.

[17] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) 118.15; 125.14.
[18] *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tog) Ta 353a.7.
[19] The use of the term *śarīra-pūjā* to refer to funeral ceremonies is also not limited to accounts dealing with monks; see *Saṅghabheda-vastu* (Gnoli) ii 40—41 where a *kinnarī* (Yaśodharā in a former life) asks the king who slayed her husband (Śākya-muni) to wait before taking her away so she could perform *śarīra-pūjā* for her dead mate: *deva tiṣṭhatu tāvat anujānīhi māṃ yāvad asya kinnarasya śarīrapūjāṃ kariṣyāmi.* The king agrees, thinking to himself: *kva gamiṣyati, paśyāmi, tāvat katham asya śarīrapūjāṃ karoti iti.*
[20] Cf. L. Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Delhi: 1961) 2394[1]; for *dril phyi* see *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* 1332[1] where *dril phyis* is defined as *lus kyi dreg pa phyis pa.*
[21] *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* (Derge) Ja 155b.4.
[22] See *Saṅghabheda-vastu* i 70.15; 163.5; etc.
[23] See below p. 41.
[24] Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 35; Schopen, *From Benares to Beijing,* 195.
[25] A. H. Longhurst, *The Story of the Stūpa* (Colombo: 1936) 13—14.
[26] As the above allusion to *vihāras* hopefully suggests, the same perceptions or assumptions that distort our reading of textual references to *stūpas* almost certainly distort our reading of such references to *vihāras.* When the term *vihāra* is translated by "monastery" this undoubtedly conceals more than it reveals. Some of the problems involved have already been acknowledged elsewhere. S. Foot, for example, has said "No writer from the early Anglo-Saxon period defined precisely what a *monasterium* (in Old English a *mynster*) was . . . *Monasterium, coenobium,* and the Old English *mynster* were in fact used synonymously, and very imprecisely, to denote a wide variety of types of establishment . . ." (S. Foot, "What was an Early Anglo-Saxon Monastery?" in J. Loades, *Monastic Studies. The Continuity of Tradition* (Bangor: 1990) 48). E. James, in regard to yet another context, has pointed to another part of the problem and to an obvious, if often overlooked, source for arriving at some clarification. He starts by citing J. Hourlier to the effect that: " 'Scholars study the history of monasticism, analyse its institutions and even explore its economic and social problems with little or no reference to a factor which is necessarily central to all monastic life, the monastery itself.' " But then he adds: "In the future we are likely to learn just as much about early medieval monastic life from the archaeologist as from the ecclesiastical or social historian" (E. James, "Archaeology and the Merovingian Monastery," in H. B. Clarke & M. Brennan, eds., *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford: 1981) 33). That all these considerations apply as well to the study of Buddhist monasticism in India probably does not need to be belabored.
[27] The Tibetan text here and just above is cited from *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tog) Ta 171b.1 and 172a.1. When Mahāprajāpatī died five hundred of her fellow nuns died with her, but this is only one example of what is something of a common-place in the accounts of the death of the great disciples — when Śāriputra died 80,000 monks also died with him; when Maudgalyāyana died 77,000 monks also passed away, Tog Ta 358b.5. Ānanda too was joined in death by a Ṛsi and 500 of his attendants who had just previously become monks, Tog Tha 469b.6ff.
[28] Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 21.

[29] cf. S. Collins, "*Kalyānamitta* and *Kalyānamittatā*," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 11 (1986), for a treatment of the term in Pāli sources.

[30] There is much, I suspect, that we do not understand, or have glossed over, in regard to the technical sense of the terms *upāsikā* and *upāsaka*. Though habitually translated by 'laywoman' or 'layman', it is beginning to appear that individuals so designated may have constituted a small group that fell somewhere between monks and nuns and the general population; they appear to have had a particularly close and formally acknowledged relationship with their monastic communities; and monks and nuns appear to have had a specific set of ritual obligations in regard to such individuals. See G. Schopen, "The Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli Vinaya," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16 (1992) 87—107, esp. 103—04, but a great deal more work needs to be done here.

[31] As one of a number of possible sources on the mutual obligations between an *ācārya* and an *antevāsin*, see J. Filliozat & H. Kuno, "Fragments du vinaya des sarvāstivādin," *Journal Asiatique* (1938) 51—52 & esp. 51 n.4.

[32] *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya-vibhaṅga* (Derge) Ta 245b.5. Two additional points are worth noting here. First this is not the only indication we have of friction between nuns and monks concerning objects of worship — both the Pāli *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga* and the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Kṣudraka-vastu* contain accounts of monks destroying *stūpas* which nuns had erected (see below p. 71 & n. 85). Second, this passage in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* presents us with a very rare canonical reference to an image containing a relic.

[33] *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tog) Ta 354a.5—368a.5.

[34] For these *uddānas* see J. L. Pangling, "Preliminary Remarks on the Uddānas in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin," in M. Aris & A. S. S. Kyi, eds., *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson* (Warminster: 1980) 226—32.

[35] *Saṅghabheda-vastu* (Dutt) iii 4, 239.17; (Gnoli) ii 264.18.

[36] For the first of these inscriptions — "securely dated to . . . about the first half of the 1st century A.D." — see R. Salomon, "The Inscription of Senavarma, King of Oḍi," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 29 (1986) 265 (lines 7a—7d), and G. Fussman, "Documents épigraphiques kouchans (III). L'inscription kharoṣṭhī de senavarma, roi d'oḍi: une nouvelle lecture," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 71 (1982) 4 (7a—7d). Note, too, that in line 12b of this inscription the relic is described as *amuda* = *amṛta* or "immortal." For the second inscription — dating to 25/26 C.E. — see G. Fussman, "Nouvelles inscriptions śaka (II)," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 73 (1984) 39 (lines b11—13).

[37] For references and further discussion see Schopen, *Religion* 17 (1987) 205—06. For some remarks on the Pāli parallel to the *Kṣudraka's* account of the death of Śāriputra see Schopen, *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.2 (1991) n. 111.

[38] The text translated here has been briefly summarized in W. W. Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order* (London: 1884) 111—12; L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1935) 276—79; G. Roth, "Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa According to the Tibetan Version of the Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra, the Sanskrit Treatise Stūpa-lakṣaṇakārikā-vivecana, and a Corresponding Passage in Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgraha," in A. L. Dallapiccola & S. Z. Lallemant, eds., *The Stūpa. Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance* (Wiesbaden: 1980) 183—85. None of these summaries, it seems,

does justice to the complexities of the account, and G. Roth in particular leaves — I think — a very distorted impression of its point when he says: "The narration of this important passage illustrates that it is the laymen who are concerned with the construction and worship of a *stūpa* and the relics . . ."

39 On the Tibetan treatment of the expression see Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 28—29, n.38.

40 What is meant here by *khyim gyi mchog gi nang du mthon po zhig tu* is particularly unclear to me. Rockhill has "put them in a high place," Roth "on a prominent place of his house."

41 For full discussions of the terms used here to designate the different parts of a *stūpa* see the papers by de La Vallée Poussin and Roth cited in n.38 above.

42 *Poṣadhasthāpana-vastu* (Dutt) iii 3, 117.1; Tog Ga 250b.6.

43 E. B. Cowell & R. A. Neil, *The Divyāvadāna. A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge: 1886) 419.16; 429.17.

44 de La Vallée Poussin, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1939) 288.

45 It is worth noting that, as with the term *vihāra* (see n. 26 above), the exact significance of *ārāma, kun dga' ra ba*, or what precisely it designates, is not yet clear. It will be noticed both here and below that the narrative of the funeral of the monk Kālodāyin, and a number of other texts including the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, conflict with the ruling in the *Kṣudraka-vastu's* account of the remains of Śāriputra and Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* in regard to the placement of the *stūpas*. The former say that the *stūpa* is, or should be, erected "at a crossing of four great roads." This is a question that cannot be treated here, but it is worth noting two things. First, none of the hundreds of *stūpas* discovered in India are — to my knowledge — situated literally "at a crossing of four great roads," but rather in, or in close association with, a Buddhist monastery. Second, "crossroads" have in Indian culture a decidedly ambivalent value (see D. D. Kosambi, "At the Crossroads: A Study of Mother-Goddess Cult Sites," in Kosambi, *Myth and Reality. Studies in the Formation of Indian Culture* (Bombay: 1962) 82—109: "The crossroads, according to Varāhamihira, bring evil repute upon any house situated near the junction (*Br.* 53.89). In *Br.* 51.4, the location is listed among inauspicious places, below the cemetery and the deserted temple"; etc.). The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* itself repeatedly refers to a category of gods associated with crossroads (*catvara-devatā*) who are supplicated by people in the hope of obtaining off-spring (*Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 139.11; *Adhikaraṇa-vastu* (Gnoli) 69.25; etc.), and they are as well a kind of no-man's-land that cannot be included in a "parish boundary" (*sīmāhṛta*) (*Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 111.10ff). The whole question needs further work.

46 Both the Pāli and its English translation are cited from P. Masefield, *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism* (London: 1986) 23.

47 For references and a discussion of this material see Schopen, *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.2 (1991) 281—329.

48 J. Marshall et al., *The Monuments of Sāñchī* (Delhi: 1940) Vol. I, 79.

49 I. H. Siddiqui, "The Early Chisthi Dargahs," in C. W. Troll, ed., *Muslim Shrines in India. Their Character, History and Significance* (Delhi: 1989) 11; 21—22.

50 E. A. Mann, "Religion, Money and Status: The Competition for Resources at the Shrine of Shah Jamal, Aligarh," in Troll, *Muslim Shrines in India*, 166; 145.

51 One of the things we know even less about is the exact historical relationship between Sufi *dargahs* and Buddhist *stūpas*, though there are some indications, and

some reasons to suspect, that their similarities might well be more than simply typological. In *Journal Asiatique* 280 (1992) there is a brief description of a paper delivered by C. Servan-Schreiber entitled " 'Dargah sur stoupa.' Une modèle d'implantation du culte des saints musulmans au Bihar (Inde)," where she speaks of "un réseau de tombes de saints musulmans établies sur des stoupas bouddhistes" (p. 401). Jackson too has pointed out that the Sufi Saint Sharafuddin Maneri lived the last forty years of his life, and was entombed, on the outskirts of the township of Bihar, the latter being, according to him, the site of the then recently occupied Vihāra of Odantapuri (P. Jackson, *The Way of a Sufi. Sharafuddin Maneri* (Delhi: 1987) 17ff). The same scholar, in speaking about "the most imposing dargah in Patna proper, that of Shah Arzan," says "very likely the elevated area where the dargah is situated marks the site of some Buddhist ruins" (P. Jackson, "Perceptions of the Dargahs of Patna," in Troll, *Muslim Shrines in India*, 106; for the same sort of thing in a much wider area see A. Stein, "Note on Buddhist Local Worship in Muhammadan Central Asia," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1910) 839ff; A. Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Wazīristān and Northern Balūchistan* (Calcutta: 1929) 20, 24, 27, 65; etc.). In addition to this topographical overlay, an overlay of a different sort has also been asserted. Haq has said, for example, "The Buddhist practice of *Chaitya-pūjā*, i.e. worship of gravemaunds of the departed saintly men (*sthavīra* or *thera* — an old man) is undoubtedly at the basis of Pīr-[saint] adoring practices . . . the descendants of *Chaitya* worshippers, when converted to Islām, became the tomb-worshippers (*Gūr-purast*) or saint-worshippers (*Pīr-purast*)" (M. E. Haq, *A History of Sufi-ism in Bengal* (Dacca: 1975) 324—25). It does not matter much that Haq has confused Hindu *Samadhis* with Buddhist *stūpas*. His assertion — rephrased as an hypothesis — is well worth pursuing. This, of course, will involve much more work on the neglected 'late' periods of Indian Buddhism.

52 Li Yung-hsi, trans., *A Record of the Buddhist Countries by Fa-hsien* (Peking: 1957) 36. The older translations of this passage differ considerably for the last two sentences — J. Legge, *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms* (Oxford: 1886) 44—45; H. A. Giles, *The Travels of Fa-Hsien* (Cambridge: 1923) 22—23; etc.

53 H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭaka* (London: 1881) iii 266; also (London: 1882) iv 156; the translation cited is from I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline* (Oxford: 1940) ii 162 — when I cited Horner's translation in G. Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13 (1989) 89, I inadvertently omitted the phrase ". . . for another shrine or . . . ."

54 *'Phags pa rin po che'i phung po lung bstan pa* (Derge) dkon brtsegs, Cha 164a.7ff; there is a Sanskrit text for this passage from the *Ratnarāśi* in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall) 56.5ff, but to judge by the Tibetan the passage there has suffered somewhat in transmission or — as frequently happens — been telescoped in quotation.

55 Some sense of the value these gifts might have had can be gotten by noticing that all three things listed — but especially "tortoise shell" — were all much sought after items of the international maritime trade at the beginning of the Common Era in which India played a major role. See the richly annotated L. Casson, *The Periplus Maris Erythraei* (Princeton: 1989) esp. 42.

56 See G. Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990) 199, where I express my ignorance of the meaning of *bud dud*, and which now, I think, can be corrected. For Bu-ston's *mchod rten la mchod pa byas pa'i phan yon* see L. Chandra,

ed., *The Collected Works of Bu Ston* (New Delhi: 1969) Part 14, Pha 560—73, esp. 561.3.

[57] H. A. Jäschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London: 1881) 343, 342.

[58] See for this type of image and references to it Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990) 199—200 and n. 77.

[59] It is worth noting — although I do not understand either reference fully — that the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācāra-saṃgraha-ṭīkā* certainly, and the *Cīvara-vastu* possibly, refer to *mahas* or "festivals" connected with some or all of the four main events of the Buddha's biography — birth, enlightenment, turning the wheel of dharma and *parinirvāṇa* — as specific sources of revenue for the monks; see Sanghasena, ed., *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācāra-saṃgraha-ṭīkā* (Patna: 1968) 41.12; J. D. M. Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices. Jayarakṣita's "Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana"* (Torino: 1983) 49—50; *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 113.8 — note that the latter does not actually use the term *maha*, but speaks, at least in part, of goods (*lābha*) received at the shrines connected with these events (*catur-mahācaityeṣu*). A close study of these passages promises to give us a glimpse, at least, of the economic functions of both such festivals and these important sites. Guṇaprabha also refers to festivals and goods received at these sites; see *Vinaya-sūtra*, Bstan-'gyur, 'dul ba, Wu 28b.7; 99b.5.

[60] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 117.8ff.

[61] See R. Lingat, *The Classical Law of India*, trans. J. D. M. Derrett (Berkeley: 1973) xiii; P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* (Poona: 1941) Vol. II, Part I, 118 (". . . nor was there in Ancient India any practice of making wills whereby large estates came to the Church as in England . . ."); cf. Vol. II, Part II, 887—88. It is Yājñavalkya who "gives preference to documentary evidence . . . and gives very detailed rules about the drawing up of legal documents" — so Lingat (99) who cites Kane as placing Yājñavalkya "in the first two centuries of the Christian Era . . . even . . . as early as the first century B.C.".

[62] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 139.6ff; esp. 140.15—141.1.

[63] Tāranātha, *History of Buddhism in India*, trans. L. Chimpa & A. Chattopadhyaya (Simla: 1970) 176—77 & n. 1; Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism* (*Chos-ḥbung*), trans. E. Obermiller (Heidelberg: 1931—32) ii 160—61; I-Ching, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago* (London: 1896) lviii, 181 & n. 3; J. Naudou *Les bouddhistes kaśmīriens au moyen age* (Paris: 1968) 57, 88; M. Tatz, *Asanga's Chapter on Ethics* (Lewiston: 1986) 28—29 & n. 36; see also the works cited in n. 65 below.

[64] Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism* ii 160; i 43; 58.

[65] See R. Sāṅkṛityāyana, "Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 23 (1937) 34—35. The first chapter of the Sanskrit text of both *sūtra* and commentary is edited in P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale, *Vinaya-sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same* (Patna: 1982); see also P. V. Bapat, "Discovery of a Sanskrit Text: *Vinaya-sūtra*," *Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth International Congress of Orientalists*, Vol. III, Part I (Poona: 1969) 343—44; Bapat, "Kṛt in a Buddhist Sanskrit Vinaya Text," *Journal of the Department of Sanskrit* (University of Delhi) Dec. 1971, 58—62; Bapat, "Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* and his Own Commentary on the Same," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 1.2 (1979) 47—51.

[66] I am now preparing a paper dealing with the section on images to be called

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the "Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya"*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 22:1 (1994:Mar.) p.31

"Bringing the Buddha into Town: Rules Governing Monastic Image Processions from an Early Medieval Text."

[67] I have corrected obvious spelling mistakes in the text without notice, the 'correct' form being found in the canonical text Guṇaprabha is drawing on, or in the auto-commentary. But in addition to a complete edition of the Sanskrit text, there is a pressing need for a critical edition of the Tibetan translation. There are a number of places where, for example, a reading in the Tibetan translation of the commentary, which cites in full the text of the *sūtra* it is commenting on, differs from the reading in the *sūtra* itself. Several centuries separate the translation of the *sūtra* (c. 9th cent.) from the translation of the commentary (12th cent.), at least according to Bapat & Gokhale (xviii, ns. 2 & 3), and this may account for some of these differences. cf. n. 76 below.

[68] For *brko ba*, which I have translated "grave," the commentary says: *sa brkos par gzhug pa* — *Svavyākhyānābhidhāna-vinaya-sūtra-vṛtti*, (Derge) Bstan-'gyur, 'dul ba, Zu 270a.4.

[69] Notice that here Guṇaprabha appears to have reworked the canonical text he appears to have been relying on. It has: . . . *yon bsngo zhing rgyun chags gsum gyi chos mnyan pa byin nas*. He therefore establishes a more 'natural' order and omits reference to the *Tridaṇḍaka* (see Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 15; 20; n. 62). He does, however, refer to the *Tridaṇḍaka* elsewhere (Derge, Wu 30a.4; 56b.6; 71a.2). He also here — as elsewhere, Wu 68a.7 — prefers *yon bshad pa* to the canonical *yon bsngo ba* for translating *dakṣiṇām ādiś-*. But the canonical text itself occasionally also uses *yon bshad pa: Poṣadha-vastu* (Dutt) iii 4, 80.8, *dakṣiṇāṁ nādiśanti* = Tog Ka 202b.2, *yon bshad par mi byed nas*.

[70] The translation "within a chamber" is not certain; cf. *dri gtsang khang* = *gandha-kuṭī*, where *gtsang khang* translates *kuṭī*.

[71] There is some variation here from the canonical vocabulary used to describe the various parts of a *stūpa* — see n. 41 above.

[72] I do not understand this sentence; cf. the canonical text on which it is presumably based cited above p. 53 .

[73] The *Kṣudraka-vastu* passage is cited and translated in full in Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 15—17.

[74] *dbyung ba dang rim gro dang chos mnyan pa dang yon bshad ma byas par byin gyis brlab par mi bya'o* — Derge, Wu 68a.7, requiring thus all the elements individually stipulated in the *Cīvara-vastu*; see Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) 7—11.

[75] cf. G. Schopen, "The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10.2 (1987) 120; Schopen, "On Monks, Nuns and 'Vulgar' Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism," *Artibus Asiae* 49 (1988/89) 164—65; etc.

[76] Derge, Zu 270a.7. This citation is a good example of the sort of thing referred to above n. 67: the text of the *sūtra* reads *da rab tu byung ba rnams* . . . , but the commentary quotes the *sūtra* as *de rab tu byung ba rnams* . . . .

[77] The French phrase is from G. Fussman & M. Le Berre, *Monuments bouddhiques de la région de caboul*, I. *Le monastère de gul dara* (Paris: 1976) 46. The examples I know where such deposits are inscribed come from outside India: C. Duroiselle, "Excavations at Hmawza, Prome," *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of*

India for 1911—12 (Calcutta: 1915) 147ff; S. Paranavitana, "Recent Discoveries at the Ruvanvāli Dāgaba (Mahāthūpa) of Anurādhapura," *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, Vol. XV for the years 1940—47 (Leiden: 1950) xlii—xlv.

[78] See *Vinaya-sūtra* (Derge) Wu 68b.6, which is ambiguous.

[79] *Cīvara-vastu* (Dutt) iii 2, 143-1—.5; *Adhikaraṇa-vastu* (Gnoli) 68.9ff; cf. *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṃgraha-ṭīka* (Sanghasena) 42.7, but the reading here is *muktāphala-*.

[80] See Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990) 193ff.

[81] Lévi, *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, 84.

[82] Cf. Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) n. 69.

[83] E. Waldschmidt, ed. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Berlin: 1951) §§42.8—10. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, s.v. *paścima*, gives *paścimā janatā* as "vulgar folk," but that sense can hardly be in play here; Tibetan is *dus phyi ma'i sems can rnams la*.

[84] *Poṣadha-vastu* (Dutt) iii 4, 72.16ff.

[85] *Kṣudraka* (Derge) Da 172b.2—174b.5.

Center for Asian Studies
University of Texas at Austin